

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 715

UD 013 477

TITLE 1971-72 Urban Education Program.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of
Urban and Community Programs Evaluation.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 102p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Data Analysis; Program Costs; Program Descriptions;
Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program
Improvement; Program Planning; *State Departments of
Education; *State Surveys; Statistical Data; *Urban
Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

During 1971-72 the State Education Department approved categorical urban aid for 297 specialized projects in 30 of the State's largest cities. There were 183 Quality Incentive Projects or grants, 83 Community Education Centers, and 31 Administrative Budgets (ABs) to administer the projects. All projects were evaluated on management and administration, program effectiveness, and finance. A number of the projects funded achieved divergent and especially worthwhile effects. Thirteen such projects are cited in this report to illustrate the positive effects that sound, well managed categorically aided projects can have upon the students in the target population. (Author/DM)


ED 076715

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1971-72

URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM



UD 013477

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
BUREAU OF URBAN AND COMMUNITY
PROGRAMS EVALUATION
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1984 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., J.D., L.H.D., LL.D., D.C.L.,
Chancellor - - - - - New York
1985 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S.,
Vice Chancellor - - - - - White Plains
1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. - - - - - Troy
1973 Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D., L.H.D. - - - - - Buffalo
1987 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S., H.H.D. - - - - - Purchase
1975 Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. - - - - - New York
1977 Joseph T. King, LL.B. - - - - - Queens
1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. - - - - - Brooklyn
1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D. - - - - - Rochester
1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., J.D., LL.D. - - - - - Glens Falls
1980 Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D. - - - - - New York
1986 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc. - - - - - Hastings
on Hudson
1982 Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. - - - - - Syracuse
1983 Harold E. Newcomb, B.A. - - - - - Owego
1981 Theodore M. Black, A.B., Litt.D. - - - - - Sands Point

President of the University and Commissioner of Education

Ewald B. Nyquist

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education

Gordon M. Ambach

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education

Thomas D. Sheldon

Associate Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education

William L. Bitner

Assistant Commissioner for Compensatory Education

Irving Ratchick

Assistant Director, Division of Urban Education

John L. House

Assistant Director, Division of Urban Education

Richard S. Weiner

Associate Commissioner for Research and Evaluation

Lorne H. Woollatt

Director, Division of Evaluation

Alan G. Robertson

Chief, Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation

Leo D. Doherty

Foreword

A temporary apportionment of categorical urban aid is provided by Education Law Section 3602, Subdivision 11. Paragraph (e) mandates a report to the legislature on the manner in which the funds are spent including the amount received by each eligible school district; the disposition of funds to other agencies or by the Department; an evaluation of the program financed and its relationship to programs funded by the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other special aid programs of the state; the extent to which programs have been incorporated into the regular school curriculum; and recommendations for future action.

The following report is tailored to meet the requirements above.

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreward	111
Summary	1
CHAPTER I: MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	9
State Management and Administration	9
Role and Function of the Division of Urban Education . .	10
Major Activities of the Division of Urban Education	13
Supportive Services of Other State Education Department Offices	15
Local School District Management and Administration	16
District Plan	16
Project Proposals and Applications	17
CHAPTER II: PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	19
Needs Impact	19
District Needs for Education of the Disadvantaged . . .	19
Reduction of Need	22
Ability of Urban Education Projects to Solve Problems of Educational Disadvantage	22
Process and Product Evaluation	30
Data Sources	30
Measurement Devices or Criteria	31
Relationship of Outcomes to Goals	34
Project Standards	36
Congruence of project implementations with proposals	36
Comparison of evaluation techniques	38
Selection of participants	40
Project Strategy	42
Extent of new and resubmitted projects.	42
Use of professional and paraprofessional staff. . . .	44
Staff directly engaged	44
Staff not directly engaged in project activities . .	46
Inservice education of staff	46
Exemplary Reports	48
Illustrations of Projects with Above Average Gains . . .	49

Table of Contents (cont'd.)

	Page
Extent of Incorporation of Process or Product Into	
Ongoing School Program	58
1970-1971 Exemplary Projects Incorporated In	
1971-72 Program	62
Achievement in Reading and Mathematics	64
CHAPTER III: FINANCE	75
Classification System	75
District Categories	75
Budget Classifications	76
Project Activities	76
Analysis Limitations	77
Project Categorizations	77
Participants	77
Reporting Procedure	78
Urban Education Expenditures	78
Projects in Urban Education Districts	79
Fiscal Analysis	81
Project Activities	84
Project Activity in New York City	84
Project Elements	87
Budget Classification in New York City	89
State and Federal Program Funds	90
Project Activities for All Programs	91
Participants in State and Federal Programs	92
Budget Expenditures for Staff in All Programs	94

List of Graphs

Chapter	Number		Page
II	1	Total State and Federal Aid Provided to Urban Education Districts	23
	2	Achievement of Urban Education Project Objectives . . .	27
	3	Relationship of Urban Education Projects to Expressed Needs	29
	4	Kind and Percent of Measuring Devices Used in Urban Education Projects	33
	5	Percent of Project Objectives Achieved by District Category by Outcome	35
	6	Methods Used by Districts to Select Participants for Urban Education Projects	41
	7	Achievement of Project Objectives by Project Group and Length of Funding	43
	8	Staff Directly Engaged in Urban Education Projects . .	45
	9	Staff Not Directly Engaged in Urban Education Project Activities.	47
	10	Percent of Staff Receiving Inservice Education	48
	11	Percent of Projects Incorporated into Ongoing School Program by Location	60
	12	Percent of Projects Incorporated into Ongoing School Program by Type	62
	13	Mean Rate of Gain Per Month for Elementary and Secondary Reading	72
	14	Mean Rate of Gain Per Month for Elementary and Secondary Mathematics	73
III	15	Percent of Approved Urban Education Funds by Project Activity Statewide	85
	16	Urban Education Funding in New York City Showing Project Activity	85
	17	Urban Education Funding in New York City Showing Community District	86

List of Graphs (cont'd.)

Chapter	Number	Page
III	18	Ranking of Project Elements by Percent of Total Cost . . 88
	19	Approved Urban Education Funding by Budget Classi- fication 89
	20	Categorical Aid for All Programs Approved for Urban Education Districts 90
	21	Project Activities for All Funded Programs in Urban Education Districts 91
	22	Estimated Number of Participants for All Programs in Urban Education Districts 92
	23	Activities With the Highest Percent of Participation in Urban Education Projects 93
	24	Budget Expenditures for Staff in All Categorical Programs in Urban Education Districts 94

List of Tables

Chapter	Number		Page
	1	Approved Urban Education Funding by School District . .	6
	2	Number of Projects by Program Type in Urban Education Districts	7
II	3	Most Common Needs for Education of the Disadvantaged Reported in District Plans April 71	21
	4	Ranking of Project Categories	24
	5	Achievement of Project Objectives by Location 1971-72 .	26
	6	A Comparison of Project Objectives Change and Project Objectives Achievements	37
	7	Distribution of Projects Classified by Category and Duration of Funding	42
	8	1970-71 Exemplary Projects with Processes and/or Products that were Incorporated into the 1971-72 Regular School Year	63
	9	Percent of Projects by Duration of Funding	70
III	10	Number of Projects by Program Type in Urban Education Districts	80
	11	Approved Urban Education Funding by School District . .	82
	12	Approved Urban Education Funding Within New York City .	83

Summary

During 1971-72 the State Education Department approved categorical urban aid for 297 specialized projects in 30 of the State's largest cities. Quality Incentive Projects or Grants (QIP or QIG), designed to correct a specific educational or motivational deficiency of pupils having special educational needs associated with poverty, numbered 183. Community Education Centers (CEC), providing educational and related services according to a priority of neighborhood and individual needs, numbered 83; such projects were located in the State's "Big Six" cities but the greatest number (77 percent) were located in the city of New York. Administrative Budgets (AB) provided funds for the administration and operation of the local projects. There were 31 such projects of which 25 were located in the city of New York:

Subdivision 11, Section 3602 of the Education Law states:

On or before December fifteenth, nineteen hundred seventy-two and nineteen hundred seventy-three, the Commissioner shall report to the legislature on the manner in which the funds provided under this subdivision were spent, including but not limited to the names of the school districts which received funds and the amount, the disposition of funds to other agencies or by the department, the programs which were financed from the funds, and an evaluation of such programs and their relationship to programs funded with moneys provided by the federal government under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of nineteen hundred sixty-five and programs funded with moneys provided by special aid programs of the State of New York, and the extent to which such programs have been incorporated into the regular school curriculum and recommendations for future action.

The Data Base

Data used for the State's Summary of the Urban Education Program were obtained mainly from the local education agencies (LEA's). The data

were late in arriving and 80 percent of the final official narrative evaluation reports were still missing on December 20th. However, all districts did report summary data on Department forms so that the report covers almost all projects, though some project data were lacking at the time of publication. The final local reports, most of which are provided by outside contractors, constitute a major portion of evaluation costs. New York City reports are late and generally provide poor data. (pages 30-31)

Exemplary Reports

A number of the projects funded achieved divergent and especially worthwhile effects. Thirteen such projects are cited to illustrate the positive effects that sound, well managed categorically aided projects can have upon the students in the target population. One important criterion for the inclusion of these exemplary reports was the provision of sufficient data both to verify the findings and to assist others who might be interested in replication of the project. (pages 48-58)

Incorporation of Findings into Regular Program

Each year there is an effort to ascertain the extent to which new specially funded educational processes or products are incorporated into regular school programs.

- A. Well over 50 percent of the 31 projects listed as exemplary last year were incorporated in whole or in part in the current program in the respective districts.
- B. Over 50 percent of the previous activities using para-professionals in the classroom, experimental elementary programs, English as a second language, basic skills, and curriculum development work were incorporated into the regular school programs. Most of such incorporation took place in New York City. (pages 58-62)

Extent of Resource Expenditure

To solve the educational problems relating to poverty for students in at least 25 percent of the State's eligible cities, the Legislature provided an increase of about 3 percent in categorical aid to school districts in the Urban Education Program. On the average, the increase in Urban Education aid amounted to less than 75 cents per potential participant per day. (pages 22-23)

Measuring Devices

In order to ascertain what techniques were being used at the local level to determine student progress and rate thereof, local district reports were separated as follows:

- A. For projects in the cognitive^{1/} domain about 60 percent employed standardized published achievement tests.
- B. For projects in the noncognitive areas over 80 percent employed a nonstandardized instrument such as an opinionnaire, interview or case study. (pages 31-33)

Achievement of Objectives

At least 20 percent of all the projects funded in the cognitive domain throughout the State achieved the objectives, mostly basic skills, while 40 percent partially achieved the objectives stated in the project application. Within the noncognitive domain a much lower percentage of projects achieved their objectives. With the latter, the lower rate may be a function of the general inability to measure precisely changes in such attributes as self image and student motivation. (pages 34-35)

Reading and Mathematics

Over 40,000 students in categorically aided programs including the Urban Education Program were studied. In the reading area, such students

^{1/}Cognitive is the mental process by which knowledge is acquired.

averaged a gain of nine tenths of a month for each month exposed to the program. In the mathematics area, another 6,300 students gained at the average rate of about one and three-fourths months for each month in the program. (pages 64-73)

Evaluation Design

Seventy-two percent of the projects in the cognitive domain used a form of pre- and post-testing to form a judgment about student progress. In the noncognitive area over 26 percent of the projects used the case study design. (pages 38-40)

Congruence of Project Implementation with Proposals

Most projects' activities or objectives are not changed during the implementation period. Projects which achieve their objectives are predominantly those which were sound in the project proposal stage. Conversely, projects which did not achieve their objectives had limited success potential from the point of their initiation. (pages 36-37)

Selecting Participants

School districts tended to let students determine their need for the benefits derived from the specialized projects. Voluntary enrollment as a selection device was indicated by at least one sixth of the district responses. Less than 10 percent of the responses stated diagnostic testing was used to select participants. (pages 40-42)

New and Resubmitted Projects

Eighty-seven percent of the 1971-72 projects had been funded for 2 to 4 years . Thus only 13 percent of the projects were new or funded for the first time. In the cognitive domain the projects with longer funding periods had more likelihood of achieving their objectives. In the non-cognitive area the reverse is true. (pages 42-44)

Use of Staff

Most of the staff were teachers and other educational professionals. A high percent of them were engaged in work directly relating to a project. A smaller percent were engaged in activities peripheral to the actual teaching. The latter category **includes guidance or similar personnel.** (pages 44-46)

Inservice Education

Nearly 3,000 staff members were exposed to a form of inservice education with the hope of making them more competent to assist with solving problems relating to poverty. Nearly 60 percent of such people were engaged in projects in the cognitive domain. (pages 46-48)

Minimal Achievement of Objectives

Projects in the basic skills category accounted for at least 25 percent of the 47 million dollars expended. Over 70 percent of such projects, at least partly achieved their objectives. (pages 34-35)

District Plans

Each district was required to file a plan for solving its educational problems relating to poverty. When the projects approved for funding in the districts were compared to such plans, it was discovered there was little relationship.^{1/} (pages 19-22)

^{1/} Separate substudy on file.

Ranking of Project Categories

When ranked using such criteria as need, objective achievement, number of projects, amount of funds used and the like, the top five project categories were: basic skills, pupil personnel services, English as a second language, early childhood education, and adult career education. (pages 22-30)

Comparison of Funds

Categorical aid from Urban Education sources available to the 30 participating districts is shown in the accompanying table 1.

The relationship of Urban Education projects to projects funded from other sources in Urban Education districts is shown in table 2. (pages 81-83)

Table 1

Approved Urban Education Funding by School District^{1/}

District	Aid	District	Aid
Albany	\$ 244,337	New Rochelle	\$ 122,037
Amsterdam	37,936	New York City	39,374,633
Binghamton	14,055	Niagara Falls	394,718
Buffalo	2,377,624	Ossining	19,648
Elmira	145,236	Port Chester	35,972
Freeport	77,183	Poughkeepsie	53,031
Fulton	28,977	Rochester	1,179,751
Glen Cove	23,589	Rome	113,537
Hempstead	93,059	Schenectady	291,219
Jamestown	31,078	Syracuse	628,132
Lackawanna	30,640	Troy	89,645
Long Beach	42,021	Utica	169,311
Middletown	33,442	Watertown	12,693
Mt. Vernon	230,539	White Plains	43,247
Newburgh	160,907	Yonkers	611,499
Total			\$46,709,616

^{1/}Wyandanch and Roosevelt public schools receive a flat grant of \$90,000 each for a total of \$180,000 under section 3602, subdivision 11, paragraph g of Chapter 553 of the Laws of 1972.

Table 2

Number of Projects by Program Type in Urban Education Districts

District	Total Urban Education Programs	Other State Supported Programs	Federal Programs	District	Total Urban Education Programs	Other State Supported Programs	Federal Programs
Albany	3		15	New Rochelle	1	1	7
Amsterdam	1	1	2	New York City	233	10	135
Binghamton	1	2	6	Niagara Falls	6		8
Buffalo	9		24	Ossining	1		4
Elmira	1		3	Port Chester	1		2
Freeport	1	1	9	Poughkeepsie	1	1	5
Fulton	1		4	Rochester	4	1	27
Glen Cove	2	1	3	Rome	1		7
Hempstead	1	1	2	Schenectady	4	1	5
Jamestown	1		3	Syracuse	4	2	10
Lackawanna	2		4	Troy	1	1	5
Long Beach	1	1	3	Utica	1		9
Middletown	1	1	2	Watertown	1		5
Mt. Vernon	4	1	7	White Plains	1	1	2
Newburgh	1	1	3	Yonkers	7	1	9
Totals				297			
				29			
				330			

CHAPTER I: MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

State Management and Administration

The Office of Compensatory Education, headed by an Assistant Commissioner, reports to the Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education. Its management components are: The Division of Urban Education which administers the State funded Urban Education Aid and the New York City School-Community Interaction Umbrella Programs; the Division of Education for the Disadvantaged which administers Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended); and the Office of Model Cities Program Services which coordinates delivery of State Education Department technical assistance to planners in the eight Model Cities Agencies and to assist the coordination of educational efforts between each Model City Agency and its corresponding city school district.

The following 1972-73 program goal of the Office of Compensatory Education is a comprehensive expression of its role and functions: To develop special services to increase the level and rate of academic achievement of the educationally disadvantaged and to overcome obstacles to equality of education encountered particularly by the poor, members of minority groups, especially in large cities, and more especially in New York City. Supportive or implementing roles include:

1. To provide support and technical services to the State Education Department (SED), local school districts and intermediate agencies, professional associations and institutions for the planning, development, and implementation of SED goals, priorities, and mandated functions pertaining to Compensatory Education, Urban Education, Title I, ESEA and Model Cities Programs Services.

2. To insure that financial and manpower resources available in the State Education Department and other local, State and Federal agencies are used to support State and Federal program priorities and to solve problems for education of the disadvantaged.
3. To effect State and Federal legislation to focus on issues and problems inherent in the administration of Compensatory Education programs on the State and local level.

Role and Function of the Division of Urban Education

In carrying out the goals of the office of Compensatory Education, the Division of Urban Education administers the State Urban Education Aid Program and the State funded New York City School-Community Interaction Umbrella Program. It provides professional leadership to help 30 districts meet the problems of inner-city education. The coordination of services includes:

- improvement of basic learning skills of program participants;
- administrative decision making;
- management practices;
- organizational skills;
- teacher education;
- community involvement;
- experimentation and innovation;
- use of professional and community resources.

Overarching the division's work is the task of not only supporting the major goals of the Office of Compensatory Education but contributing to the efficient delivery of effective compensatory and developmental educational services to eligible participants. Eligible participants are persons having demonstrable special educational needs associated with poverty and who have not earned a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Demonstrable special educational needs are critical deficiencies in basic learning skills and other learnings which, if not ameliorated, can contribute substantially to serious economic or social problems.

While the poverty status of individuals is presumed by their residence in a geographical area as specifically defined by the school district, the degree of educational need is indicated by a sample of individuals performance in the statewide Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) tests.

The division works toward the resolution and prevention of educational problems associated with urban poverty through leadership and supportive services to the local school districts and the State Education Department.

The specific functions of the division include:

1. Project grant application review. Review analysis, and determination of whether planned expenditures in school district project proposals are reimbursable from Urban Education and New York City Umbrella funds. Standards for reimbursability are embodied in the specific Urban Education Aid and New York City Umbrella legislation, in other education laws, in the Commissioner's Regulations and by the educational principles and practices supported by departmental units such as the Division of Educational Finance, the Division of Evaluation and subject matter specialists which review project proposals. Department standards are further detailed in the Urban Education Guidelines and in the series of statements embodied in the program bulletins prepared by the Division of Urban Education and issued by the Office of Compensatory Education.

The Commissioner's Regulations stipulate the following criteria as bases for judging the extent to which proposed projects are designed to carry out effectively the purposes of the State Urban Education Program, i.e. that:

- the expected educational benefits accrue to the maximum number of disadvantaged pupils who might be benefited; or
- the expected educational benefits are substantial in themselves rather than remote or incidental to other purposes or goals;
- a project is educationally sound as determined by its staff, facilities, activities and duration;

- the project seeks to meet previously neglected needs not met by other funds;
 - sufficient provisions have been made for the administration and evaluation of the project; and
 - the project is economically sound.
2. Technical assistance - regulatory. Perform office and field activities involved in securing local district adherence to applicable laws, Commissioner's Regulations, program guidelines, and policy bulletins. Includes onsite visits, consultation with local and SED staff, and carrying out regulatory action, such as arbitrating complaints, disagreements and overseeing resolution of the problem, and, as necessary, assisting districts to readjust program activities when such activities have strayed outside of the accepted program description and beyond the purposes of the Urban Education aid.
 3. Technical assistance - consultative. Perform services in the Department or field to assist districts in improving the quality of Urban Education, Umbrella, or other departmental programs bearing on inner-city education.
 4. Contract development and implementation. Perform field and office assistance to school districts in monitoring contracts between the districts and contractors for services, such as evaluation and consultation.
 5. Reporting. Prepare or contribute to reports and advisories on the programs and on related legislation. These reports include: the Commissioner's annual report to the Legislature on the Urban Education program, monthly divisional reports, and specially requested program reports.
 6. Publications. Prepare and distribute forms, guidelines, bulletins, general reports, and weekly program status reports.
 7. Planning. Perform activities related to the systematic management of educational development. These activities include service on departmental task forces and programs relevant to Urban Education, such as the Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education Planning Council, Drug Education, New York City Decentralization, and ESEA Title V-505 Interstate Effective Urban Teacher project designed to identify characteristics of effective urban teachers and teaching.
 8. Program development. Perform leadership activities related to planning and developing exemplary or model inner-city educational programs funded under the Urban Education and New York City Umbrella programs in general, including workshops, conferences, and provision of divisional staff consultative

and program review services to other related departmental programs, such as Title I ESEA, Model Cities, bilingual education, reading, and others.

Major Activities of the Division of Urban Education

Since the school and State fiscal years overlap, the actual reporting period for management activities described in Chapter I is April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972. However, the program effectiveness report (Chapter II) and the financial data (Chapter III) were reported for the school year which is July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972.

During State fiscal year 1971-72, the Division of Urban Education expended approximately 1,650 professional and 1,150 clerical mandays to support the delivery of effective Urban Education and New York City Umbrella educational services to pupils. Vacancies at both levels prevented the full utilization of 8 professional and 6 clerical positions. The related activities included: regulatory activities; technical assistance to local programs; project grant application review; project monitoring; and contract development and monitoring.

Of the above manpower expenditures, approximately 310 professional and 200 clerical mandays were expended in direct field services, including conferences with local district program managers, assistance in planning, onsite project monitoring visits, and regional conferences. This manpower expenditure represents about 80 field service days for each of the 4 staff members directly administering the division's work with the participating districts. This means that each was in the field an average of about 40 percent of a school year when summer programs are added and about 38 percent of a 215 day man year. Heavy field work is essential both to regulate and to assist the development of effective programs, as well as

to assist districts to resolve critical problems in the areas of community and parental involvement, administrative organization, planning, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination.

During early Spring, 1972 the Division conducted 9 regional two-day conference-workshops focusing on district project plans for the 1972-73 funding period. The invitations were extended to professional staff of the district as well as community school board members and advisory committee chairmen. Department representation included staff from the Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation, Division of Educational Finance, Bureau of Reading Education, Division of Teacher Education and Inservice Education, Division of Research and others. The first day was devoted to a full group discussion based on a prepared agenda, the second day was used for individual conferences between district staff and Department personnel. A review of the critique forms received from participants indicated a widespread desire to continue such regional conference-workshops on an annual basis. Two important results came about from these meetings; the organization of interdistrict visitation by district personnel and a pilot evaluation program on the part of a district in Queens.

Staff members from the division conducted office hours for New York City districts during which staff from districts met at a pre-arranged hour in a central location with the division representative for consultation. This proved to be an effective and popular method to multiply the productive relationships between the division and local district staff members. It also allowed staff of a number of local districts to exchange information and ideas on all aspects of the program.

In addition to direct services, the division performed management functions (which constituted the major portion of professional staff time);

reporting to the Legislature and other agencies (approximately 65 professional and 45 clerical mandays); and relating with other departmental programs dealing with problems of inner-city education (approximately 80 professional and 10 clerical mandays).

Included in the above activities were services to the Executive Council of Project Redesign;^{1/} Commissioner's Task Force of New York City Decentralization; Multi-ethnic Task Force, and Task Force on Drug Abuse. Other special services included the ESEA Title V-505 Interstate Project on Effective Urban Teachers; Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education Planning Council; Department review of the Fleischmann Commission report; and Project Reading Alert. The Division extended intradepartmental consultative services to the Office of Model Cities Services, ESEA Title I, Title III, and Title VII, Office of Occupational Education, and Division for Handicapped Children.

Supportive Services of Other State Education Department Offices

The Department evaluated the outcomes of the 1971-72 local Urban Education programs through the services of the Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation (Division of Evaluation) which was also responsible for the preparation of the program effectiveness and finance sections of this report. The Bureau expended approximately 645 professional mandays in assisting districts to prepare acceptable evaluation designs, providing consultative services on evaluation problems, designing evaluative report forms, collating and analyzing evaluative data, and writing the Legislative report.

^{1/}Detailed definitions of such services are on file in the Division.

The Department's State Aided Programs Bureau of the Division of Educational Finance expended approximately 490 professional and 641 clerical mandays (including temporary per diem staff) and to review program budgets and modifications, consult with school district and division personnel on problems related to finance, and approved payments against expenditure reports.

In addition, 24 departmental divisions, bureaus, and units provided project proposal review, technical assistance, and consultative services to the division and local school districts for which no funds were provided. Included were the areas of general education, curriculum, bilingual education, safety education, school libraries, pupil personnel services, prekindergarten education, child development, parent education, the arts and humanities, intercultural relations (integration), research, communications, inservice education, health and drug education, occupational education, and educational management. Approximately 1,100 professional and 236 clerical mandays were expended for the above mentioned services.

Local School District Management and Administration

District Plan

Local school districts receiving Urban Education aid are required to submit a District Plan in accordance with Commissioner's Regulations. The purpose of the District Plan is to provide the district and the Department with a comprehensive study of its educational needs in relation to its poverty areas. It describes the major strategies to be used to alleviate these needs with specification of broad objectives in relation to Urban Education target groups. These objectives are expected to determine the specific directions taken in Urban Education projects.

In 1970, the District Plan format was revised to strengthen the local planning process. A subsequent analysis of the revised District Plans against 1971-72 projects indicates that the plans and related projects are not fully congruent because of the following factors. Many project proposals were not in line with the District Plans because earlier projects tend to be recycled and thus were in existence prior to the revision of the District Plan. New York City community school districts find little demographic and other data available for the areas within district boundaries. In addition, many school districts engaged in limited intermediate or long range work and program planning. With some notable exceptions, as gleaned from field visits, the Urban Education District Plan does not seem to play a significant part in whatever district planning occurs.

The Division of Urban Education cannot mandate that districts use District Plans beyond Urban Education projects, only that the Plans be filed with the Department as one of the reimbursement conditions stipulated in the Commissioner's Regulations. Through the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, program priorities for the 1972-73 school year were established as reading, mathematics and bilingual education. Districts were expected to recast district plans in terms of the three priority activities.

The Division does use its working relationships with local districts to help them move toward comprehensive program planning. There is evidence of an emerging concern by local district personnel, and the Office of Compensatory Education will continue to provide leadership to actuate that concern.

Project Proposals and Applications

The project proposals and applications are submitted to the Division of Urban Education, and through the Division to other Departmental offices

for activities, applying criteria as previously mentioned. When projects have been determined to be reimbursable, a letter is sent to chief school administrators informing them of this determination.

In cooperation with the Rochester City School District, the Division of Urban Education is conducting a management experiment in which, for 1972-73 operations, the district will submit applications for reimbursement following local implementation of projects. The experiment was undertaken because it is believed that the process would be placed in the correct context, inasmuch as the district proposes the project activities and the Department determines whether planned local expenditures for project activities are reimbursable by the State through the Urban Education aid formula. Actual final approval for reimbursement follows completion of the year's project activities as planned or amended and submission by the district of required program and financial reports. Should the Rochester experimental management model be adopted, Departmental staff would be available for advice and consultation prior to project proposal writing, during the implementation of projects. Essential departmental field services would continue. In addition, districts would continue to have the option of seeking a determination of reimbursability prior to implementation, as at present. The most important advantage would be implementation of projects as early as possible, with Departmental staff working collaboratively and cooperatively with local district staff. In addition, the responsibility for projects would properly be highlighted as falling mainly within the local district's cognizance.

CHAPTER II: PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The Urban Education Program is compensatory in nature. Compensation was needed because there had been a continuing deficit in program results of some students in recent years, especially of those residing in inner cities. Thus in 1968 the State's Legislature appropriated a sum in excess of 50 million dollars to help solve the educational problems associated with poverty. Money for the ensuing specialized program was made available to 30 of the State's larger school districts.

If all of the potential projects are categorized into two major types they are: A. Those projects whose objective sought to bring about some improvement in the learner's ability to perform some of the basic skills such as those in reading, mathematics or the like; such projects are usually referred to as being in the cognitive domain, and B. Noncognitive projects; those which tend to bring about changes in the learners self image, attitude, interest or other peripheral area felt to be a prerequisite for learning.

Needs Impact

When society determines what the minimum levels of educational attainment should be, such levels are usually accompanied by a corresponding statement of the current status of such attainment. The difference between the existing status and the expected or desirable goal is an indicator of the intensity of the need.

District Needs for Education of the Disadvantaged

School districts participating in the Urban Education Program were required to submit district plans in which school and community personnel

developed a list of educational needs of the disadvantaged. Consideration was given to community characteristics, population trends, ethnic composition, current educational programs, sources of funds and any additional factors that would bear upon the establishment of a district plan. By November, 1971 all districts had provided a district plan although the thoroughness with which the task had been accomplished varied from very good to marginal. Six districts listed 14 or more needs but the average number was 7.

Table 3 lists in decreasing order of selection the most commonly stated needs for education of the disadvantaged. Many needs identified for New York City districts differ greatly from needs specified for upstate and Long Island districts. The most common needs were associated with the acquisition, diagnosis and remediation of basic skills such as reading, math, science and social studies. In support areas, the districts expressed needs for improved student attitudes, greater involvement in education by parents and training of teachers on methods for instructing the disadvantaged. It is of interest that little need was expressed for narcotics education, cultural heritage instruction and programs for speech correction, music, art instruction and physical education. Since the responses were open-ended, nonlisting of a need may have been due in part to oversight. Another approach to need determination would involve districts in determining the strength of a list of specified needs.

The needs of districts may vary widely because of ethnic composition, present achievement levels, and the presence of needs specific to the district.

- Bilingual programs are probably essential to meet the educational needs of some districts yet are of minor consequence to upstate districts not having a large non-English speaking population. Cultural heritage programs are

Table 3
Most Common Needs for Education of the Disadvantaged
Reported in District Plans
April 1971

Needs for Education of the Disadvantaged	Percent of Districts Identifying Need		
	N.Y.C.	Upstate & Long Island	Total of 30 Districts
1. Improved basic skills instruction	74	65	70
2. Preventive and remedial help with basic skills	64	37	51
3. Student attitude improvement	54	41	48
4. Parent involvement with pupil learning	61	34	48
5. English as a second language	74	13	45
6. Individualized and small group instruction	41	44	43
7. Inservice training of teachers on instructing the disadvantaged	58	20	40
8. Dropout prevention program	32	28	31
9. Guidance, counseling and physical examinations	45	13	30
10. Paraprofessional programs and training	38	13	26
11. Cultural enrichment and broadening experiences	41	10	26
12. New methods and materials	45	6	26
13. Improved staff attitudes about the disadvantaged	29	17	23
14. Adult betterment and instruction of the lower socioeconomic group	22	24	23
15. Early childhood education	38	6	23
16. Self identity development and improved self-esteem	22	20	21
17. Better use of community resources	12	17	15
18. Social adjustment	25	0	13
19. Vocational education for in-school students	12	13	13
20. Facilities and special programs for the disruptive child	22	0	11
21. Improved administration of programs for the disadvantaged	12	10	11
22. Neighborhood education programs for the pupil	3	20	11
23. Basic skills for out-of-school youth	6	17	11
24. Cultural heritage instruction	22	0	11
25. Provision of health, nutrition and psychological services	9	10	10
26. Narcotics education	19	0	10
27. Provision of informal educational environment and improved study habits	16	0	8
28. Improved integration	0	13	6
29. Relevant course content	0	13	6
30. Flexibility of staff in meeting needs	0	13	6
31. Improvement of critical thinking by students	9	0	5
32. Physical education programs	0	10	5
33. Speech correction programs	0	10	5
34. Music and art instruction	6	0	3
35. Redesign of facilities for the disadvantaged	3	3	3
36. Design of evaluation instruments	0	3	1

likewise not uniformly needed. Consequently, the number of districts identifying a particular need as important may indicate the geographical peculiarities of needs as well as the intensity of the needs. Districts have the responsibility for determining not only whether a need exists but also whether it necessitates setting up a project. Finally, districts must also consider whether a proposed project is likely to satisfy the need.

Reduction of Need

If it is assumed that at least 25 percent of the State's population and therefore 25 percent of the State's largest city's enrollments were educationally deprived, the relationship of money provided for the reduction of need to the actual need reduction may be ascertained.


For the 30 districts which received Urban Education funds, the total aid provided by the State from all State and Federal sources was \$1,055,278,008. In graph 1, that sum constitutes 100 percent. Federal aid amounted to \$226 million or about 21 percent of the total.

Ability of Urban Education Projects to Solve Problems of Educational Disadvantage

The needs of the educationally disadvantaged determine what projects should be established, what priority they should receive, how much funding should be allocated and how much improvement should be expected. Needs were established in the district plans by school and community leaders. To the extent that needs have been satisfied by project operation, Urban Education expenditures are beneficial. Measurement of change resulting from project implementation can be done most practically on a project basis. However, no

Graph 1

Total State and Federal Aid Provided to Urban Education Districts



single project evaluation is of sufficient size for generalizations of results which can be used alone to justify similar expenditures. Therefore, the results of numerous evaluations of one type project are combined and an effort made to determine the extent to which the needs relating to that category of projects have been met. Thus, the results of eight projects designed to promote bilingual education may be used to determine the extent to which the need for bilingual instruction has been met by the program generally.

For purposes of administration, analysis and program strategy, the 297 projects in operation during the 1971-72 school year were categorized into 15 groups of similar projects. Table 4 lists the number of projects and the percent of funds in each category. A description of project activities in each category is given in chapter III.

Table 4
Ranking of Project Categories ^{1/}

Category	Need % ^{2/}	Achieve- ment	Number Projects	Funds %	Weighted Average ^{3/}	Rank
Basic Skills	70	71.8	78	25	100	1
Pupil Personnel Services	30	38.9	54	22	55	2
English as Second Language	45	50	10	6	48	3
Early Childhood Education	23	64.3	14	6	47	4
Adult Career Education	23	57.1	7	3	39	5
Experimental	0	60	10	11	36	6
Support Services	26	29.2	24	6	31	7
Recruitment and Employment	26	31.6	19	5	30	8
Cultural Enrich- ment	26	25	20	3	26	9
Curriculum Development	6	44.4	9	4	25	10
Vocational-Occu- pation Ed.	13	40	5	*	23	11
Community Educa- tion	23	**	4	2	17	12
Health Education	10	**	3	2	9	13
Bilingual Educa- tion	*	12.5	8	1	3	14
Handicapped	0	*	1	*	1	15

* / Less than one percent

** / Insufficient data

^{1/} Does not include administration. See Chapter III for a description of each category.

^{2/} Column total exceeds 100% because districts could indicate a need in more than one category.

^{3/} The weighted average on a scale of 100 was obtained by assigning one-third of the variance in each category to need, one-third to achievement, one-sixth to number of projects and one-sixth to percent of funds.

In the table, the first column is the percent of districts indicating need served by projects in each category. The second column is a measure of achievement of the objective designed to satisfy the need. Since the number of projects and amount of funds expended on each category are not proportionately related to each other, a weighted average of four measures was used.

The category "basic skills" was ranked number one based on the four measures listed in the table. All other categories were ranked in relationship to the first category. Thus the project category "handicapped had the lowest ranking (15).

Ideally, an evaluation of project activities would be developed out of a careful and detailed analysis of need. Behavioral objectives would be developed. Evaluation instruments specifically relating to project activities would be developed and standardized. Testing would be carried out and the results analyzed statistically to determine whether an improvement can be related to the project activity.

In practice, a listing of needs is often less than ideal. Behavioral objectives sometimes are not sufficiently detailed and norm referenced tests rather than criterion referenced tests are used to measure outcomes. Nevertheless, each Urban Education project is evaluated using the best methods and instruments that the school district evaluator can employ within his limitations. Thus, the primary measure of the ability of projects to meet the needs of the disadvantaged is the testing program of the local school district. The State Education Department reviews the evaluation process of the local school districts at least four times each year during review of the proposal and upon the subsequent receipt of the Mailed Interim Information Report form. Data are requested on pretest scores, posttest scores, predicted posttest scores or control group scores, score gains which would occur without the project and the statistical significance of the gains. From the data the Department is able to identify which projects have demonstrated a significant improvement in the area tested.

The relationship of 12 project categories and the percentage of projects in each category that at least partially achieved ^{1/} the stated objectives is indicated in graph 2. A single project may have several objectives that are measured with a series of evaluation instruments. Significant improvement often is found in some measures but no improvement in others. Several of the project categories contained fewer than five projects so generalizations from them were unreliable and were not presented. They were the categories of health education, handicapped, and community education.


One factor that became evident in the analysis was the difference in achievement gains in different project locations. These differences are shown in table 5.

Table 5
Achievement of Project Objectives by Location
1971-72

<u>Location</u>	<u>Percent of Effective Projects</u>
New York City Community Districts	42.2
New York City Central Board	47.8
Big Five Cities	75.0
Rest of State	73.5

The lower effectiveness of New York City projects may be due to the limited number and perhaps less appropriate evaluations of New York City projects. Analysis of 1969-70 projects revealed that more detailed local evaluations of projects were conducted upstate than in New York City by a factor of almost two to one. The situation is due to the fact that a single contractor may be employed to evaluate a dozen projects in one New York City community school district. Thus some projects received only a paragraph in the resultant umbrella like report, whereas, upstate each project was reported in a separate report.

^{1/}Level of achievement of project objectives is defined later in this chapter.



Graph 2

Achievement of Urban Education Project Objectives
1971-72

1/ Level of achievement is discussed later in this chapter.

The measurement of relative effectiveness of projects is undoubtedly affected by the relative ease in measuring cognitive learning compared to measuring affective changes. In a later section it will be shown that those categories having the largest number of effective projects were cognitively oriented (e.g., related to the learning of basic skills). The least effective projects in terms of data reported by districts involved noncognitive changes such as changed attitudes, motivation, enrichment and cultural activities. Most devices which are used to measure such changes are primitive compared to devices which have been developed to measure cognitive changes.

Another measure of meeting the needs of the disadvantaged is the frequency with which projects in the category are carried out, continued year by year, evaluated and expanded as the need becomes clarified. In some cases, advisory committees continuously review project implementation and recommend discontinuance if no value is apparent, if insufficient children need the instruction, if its evaluation is negative or inconclusive, or if more efficient means can be found to meet the need. Similarly, a costly project may be discontinued if a less expensive but equally effective method can be employed.

Although it is difficult to measure the absolute extent to which project activities are meeting the needs of the disadvantaged, it is possible to obtain an indication of the extent to which individual categories of projects relate to needs. On graph 3 is plotted the relationship between expressed needs of the school districts as identified in their district plan and projects undertaken to meet the needs.

A number of interesting interpretations can be drawn from the graph. Basic skills is the most needed category and by far the most projects are directed to resolving that need. None of the districts indicated a need for a project specifically directed to the needs of the disadvantaged who

Graph 3

Relationship of Urban Education Projects to Expressed Needs



are handicapped. Although 23 percent of the districts expressed a need for adult career development, only 7 projects were established for that purpose. Similarly, English as a second language was identified as a need by 45 percent of the districts yet only 18 projects were undertaken. Thus, the data suggests that the need for projects in these categories is not being met. On the other hand, more pupil personnel service projects were funded than the analysis of needs would suggest were required.

Process and Product Evaluation

While many of the specially funded projects are reported in terms of the relative effectiveness of the resultant product, the processes used are oftentimes equally important.

Thus the following section is related to both the process and the product.

Data Sources

In its most concise form the Urban Education Program is evaluated in each school district according to an evaluation agreement between each school district and the Department. Results are submitted to the Department where they are summarized for all projects in the State and recommendations based upon the findings are made to program administrators and the Legislature. Evaluation results are used locally to effect program changes and develop a sense of accountability. The results are used at the State level to modify emphasis on program categories and to modify project operation procedures. The overall success of the program is dependent upon adequate evaluation designs and ability to carry out the evaluations at the district level. At the State level evaluation requirements consist of reviewing evaluation proposals, updating evaluation

requirements yearly to obtain better results and providing an adequate analysis of the submitted data. Submission of a Mailed Interim Information Report (MIIR) by all school districts which received Urban Education funds provided the Department with similar types of data for all projects. However, it is inappropriate for \$1,373,757 to be spent on evaluations by school districts while \$60,669 is spent on salaries for personnel to analyze the resulting data at the State level. The last phase of the total evaluation operation should be as extensive as the data permit. Since accountability is such an important aspect of State and Federal programs, it is essential that adequate time and funds be provided for the last crucial phase. The funds available for evaluation at the State level were \$80,000 less this year than in previous years and some deficiencies in the analysis of data can be attributed to this cause.

Measurement Devices or Criteria

In the field of education, statements about the learner's rate of gain or extent of gain are usually accompanied by questions about the devices used for measuring such gains. In a broad sense, such measuring devices may be separated into two categories; those which are standardized and those which are not. The word standardized carries the connotation of the elimination or reduction of chance variations due to repeated test administrations with representative groups on a broad population base. Additionally such tests are usually subjected to critical reviews by specialists nationwide. For example there are 1,157 tests listed in The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook^{1/} which are accompanied by 798 test reviews. In summary, educators

^{1/} Buros, Oscar, K., The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook. The Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey. 1972.

tend to put more confidence in educational gains which are accompanied by rigorous testing or measurement procedures than they put in teacher tests, observations or other adult opinions.

Recently, there has been another broad distinction between those tests which were standardized on a sample of the population, which are referred to as norm-referenced tests, and those which were based on the learner's ability to behave or perform in a specified fashion upon conclusion of the treatment. The latter measuring devices are referred to as criterion-referenced tests.

Using the Division of Urban Education coding system, Urban Education projects also were classified by major component according to whether the thrust was cognitive or noncognitive in nature.^{1/}

All of the measuring devices used with the Urban Education Program were tabulated, separated by either cognitive or noncognitive projects and converted to a percent within each of the two project types.


From graph 4 it may be seen that with the cognitive projects nearly 60 percent called for the use of standardized published achievement tests and further over 71 percent of all the cognitive projects were those which called for the use of some standardized form of test.

In the noncognitive projects the most prevalent (over 80 percent) type of measuring instrument was non-standardized. Additionally about 50 percent of the project measurement in the noncognitive domain was accomplished through the use of an opinionnaire, opinion survey, interview, case study, or observation.

^{1/} Bloom, B. S., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. 1956.

Graph 4

Kind and Percent of Measuring Devices Used in Urban Education Projects



Legend

□ Cognitive

■ Non-Cognitive

SA-Standardized published achievement test
SD-Standardized diagnostic instrument
SR-Standardized rating scale
SAT-Standardized attitudinal scale

NST-Non-Standardized teacher made achievement of performance test
NSR-Non-Standardized rating scale
NSQ-Non-Standardized questionnaire or inventory
NSA-Non-Standardized attitudinal scale or survey
NSO-Non-Standardized opinionnaire, opinion, survey, interview, case study, observation

Relationship of Outcomes to Goals

Data provided by the school districts were analyzed to assess to what extent project goals were attained. Three distinctions were made:

- A. Projects were considered to have achieved their goals if there was concrete evidence of a statistical nature showing that at least 75 percent of the goals were met.
- B. When there was sound evidence that between 25 percent and 75 percent of the goals were met, that project was categorized as "partially achieved."
- C. When less than 25% of the goals were met according to the statistical evidence, the project was described as "not achieved." The category was employed when the evidence indicated the goals were not met, even if the local districts claimed the project was successful.

All of the funded projects were divided into two major groups, cognitive and noncognitive, and within those two, further divided into four major district achievement categories. Within the resulting district achievement categories, the percent each project objective achievement category constituted of the number of projects for that district category was computed. The computed percentages are exhibited in graph 5. The graph design and computation may be explained as follows: There were 107 projects funded in the New York City Community School Districts in the cognitive domain. Twenty-one (19 percent) of the 107 projects achieved the project objective, while 44 projects (41 percent) and 42 projects (39 percent) of the 107 either partially achieved or did not achieve the project objectives.


Within the cognitive domain New York City had the lowest percent of projects which achieved objectives while the rest of the State exclusive

of the Big Five Cities had the highest percent.

Within the noncognitive domain the results are different. The New York City Central Board had the highest percent of objectives achieved while the rest of the State and the remaining Big Five Cities not only had the lowest percent. No upstate district in either category had one project which achieved its objectives. In summary the relationship of project outcomes to project goals is relatively low.

Graph 5

Percent of Project Objectives Achieved by District Category by Outcome



Project Standards

Project proposals submitted by local districts must meet the minimum standards established by the State.

Congruence of project implementation with proposals. All of the project reports were separated into three levels of project objectives i.e.,

- A. Achieved
- B. Partially achieved
- C. Not achieved

All three levels were defined earlier. The intent herein was to ascertain whether or not there was a relationship between achievement of goals in project proposals which were changed during the implementation period and proposals which were not changed.

All of the projects were further divided into those which were implemented in the city of New York and those implemented in the rest of the State.

From the data in table 6 it can be seen the highest proportion of projects were in the category of "No change". (65 percent)

Over 18 percent (11/58) of all the projects upstate achieved their goals and all of these were in the category of "No change." In the city of New York 12 percent (26/208) achieved their objectives. Of these, nearly 8 percent were in the category of "No change." Seventy-two percent of the upstate projects and 63 percent of the New York City projects were implemented without change. Thus, the remaining projects implemented were not congruent with the original project proposals. However, there is no guarantee that adherence to the original proposal will yield the achievement of project objectives. It is clear from the data that sound projects, that is, projects

which achieve their objectives, are those which are sound in the first instance and therefore required no change. Conversely projects which do not achieve their objectives are those which did not undergo change of some kind during the implementation period and may therefore have had limited success potential from the beginning.

Table 6
A Comparison of Project Objectives Change and Project Objectives Achievement

Upstate Level of Achievement				Project Change Category	New York City Level of Achievement			
Total	Not	Par- tially	Ach.		Ach.	Par- tially	Not	Total
42	10	21	11	No Change	16	45	71	132
1	-	1	-	Objectives Only	-	-	1	1
4	2	2	-	Activities Only	4	3	3	10
1	-	1	-	Activities & Objectives	-	-	2	2
3	2	1	-	Other	-	-	5	5
7	1	6	-	Excused from Reporting	6	15	37	58
58	15	32	11	Total	26	63	119	208

Comparison of evaluation techniques. Many evaluation techniques can be used to evaluate Urban Education projects but only a few of those used such as those which follow, yielded results of maximum usefulness. The best method is probably that in which an experimental group is compared with a matched control group. In this technique, the control group continues the regular educational pattern while the experimental group carries out the activities specified in the project proposal. Differences in the final status of the groups, if significant, may be attributed to project activities. In many instances this classic research method is unsuited for use in Urban Education project assessment since the design precludes some of the eligibles (the half used as the control group) from participating in the proposed new project activities.

The evaluation method most often employed in Urban Education projects was a comparison of actual gains of a single group with the gain that can be predicted for that group had it simply continued in conventional instruction. To predict growth in one subject area the average growth per year that the individual has made in that subject must be calculated. The predicted growth is compared with the actual growth that occurs when the project is in operation. The procedure may be called a single group evaluation technique. Initial conditions are identical since a single group provides identical data for both measures of growth.

Modifications of the single group method are possible but they are less desirable. The first is the use of growth norms established by the test producer for disadvantaged students. Because disadvantaged students vary widely, the method in which district norms are employed is not very accurate.

One evaluation method which requires statistical manipulation of data is the assessment method in which a battery of tests is employed,

but by a sampling technique each participant is exposed to only one test. Assessment may be carried out at several grade levels, in several geographical areas and under a range of experimental conditions.

The case study technique may be employed where individuals in a project are treated differently and therefore cannot be tested with a common instrument. Guidance projects fall into this category. A relatively small number of students are studied but much information is gathered about each of them. Through the use of such a method evaluators are able to study a project in depth and begin to develop appropriate measuring instruments.

The skilled observation method employs a team of trained professionals who make ratings on the accomplishment of educational objectives. The average rating may be used as a measure of an activity's worth. Where a large number of factors are involved, the evaluation team can be informed of the factors and can judge how each factor contributed to overall performance. Ratings of a program made in this manner can be compared with each other when a large number of ratings have been obtained. Comparisons also can be made during a year. However, ratings are of limited usefulness since norms are seldom available and absolute values are hard to obtain.

Without statistically significant results, one must attribute any differences to chance. If the measured difference is small, then a very large sample of students is required. If the difference is less than a few percent there may not be enough students in a district for a statistically

significant result to be obtained. However, if a gain resulting from a program is large then only a small number of students may need to be tested to demonstrate significance. Usually a gain of a few percentage points is of little interest. To obtain significant gains it is important to make major changes in methods since one seldom expects much improvement from a minor change. Many educators think of learning increasing with time spent in study. Also, there is a belief that the learning rate decreases with increased class size. Some educators expect that improved attitudes will improve learning but such a relationship is not clearly delineated in the educational literature. In Urban Education projects most funds are used to decrease class size and a considerable proportion is used to improve attitudes and make other noncognitive changes.


Selection of participants. Districts were asked to list for each major component and activity the method(s) by which participants were selected for the Urban Education funded project. A total of 1192 responses were received. Although that number is many times in excess of the number of funded projects, many projects used more than one method of selecting participants and many projects have several components.

Of the total, over 61 percent of the responses were for the cognitive projects and the remaining 38 percent were for the noncognitive projects. The highest percent (19 each) of the total number indicated that "voluntary enrollment" and "referral by the guidance counselor" were the most prevalent selection methods.

Using the cognitive and noncognitive project categories, the percent of each method of selection within those two classifications is displayed in graph 6.

Graph 6

Methods Used by Districts to Select Participants for Urban Education Projects



It is apparent that there must be an immediate effort to change the respective positioning of "voluntary enrollment" and "diagnostic testing". The fact that a participant feels some need for the exposure is not a substitute for systematically obtaining information that educators need for improving pupil skills.

Project Strategy

An examination of the available data provides another indication as to which projects are successful in serving the needs of educationally disadvantaged students.

Extent of new and resubmitted projects. All of the projects which operated during the 1971-72 program year were categorized according to the number of years which they had been funded with Urban aid. Projects in each of the categories were further classified according to the nature of the majority of project objectives. That is, if most of the objectives of a project were related to the cognitive domain, the entire project was classified as cognitive.

In the following table the distribution of projects by category and number of years of funding is presented.

Table 7

Distribution of Projects Classified by Category
and Duration of Funding


Category	Years Funded				Total
	1	2	3	4	
Cognitive	17	40	50	49	156
Noncognitive	17	37	29	27	110
Totals	34	77	79	76	266

Eighty-seven percent of all projects have been funded for two or more years. The majority of the objectives of 58.6 percent of the projects were cognitively categorized.

The effectiveness of each project funded during 1971-72 was determined as previously described. Three categories of project effectiveness were created and the relationship of the number of years of funding and project effectiveness is presented in the following graph.

Graph 7

Achievement of Project Objectives by Project Group
and Length of Funding




From the graph, it may be seen that proportionately twice as many projects in the cognitive domain (64.6 percent) at least partly achieved their objectives compared with projects in the non-cognitive category (28.1 percent). Proportionately 50 percent as many of the new cognitive projects (funded one year) at least partly achieved their goals as those cognitive projects which were funded for any greater length of time studied. The greatest proportion of projects which were classified as at least partly achieving their objectives were cognitive projects funded for four years. The greatest proportion of projects which were classified as not achieving their objectives were noncognitive projects funded for two years.

Approximately the same proportion of cognitive and non-cognitive new projects were categorized as not achieving their objectives. However, proportionately twice as many non-cognitive projects as cognitive projects were categorized as not achieving their goals when they were funded for two, three, or four years.

Use of professional and paraprofessional staff. Data from Mailed Interim Information Reports were tabulated to yield comparative information about the use and kind of staff and their inservice education as paid for through Urban Education funds. Several analyses of the data were carried out enabling distinctions to be made between cognitively and noncognitively oriented project requirements.

Staff directly engaged. Data concerning 4500 staff members, directly engaged in working with the participants of the Urban Education program were analyzed. Of the total there were over three times as many members engaged in the cognitive projects as in the noncognitive projects. It may be seen in

graph 8 that the highest percent of the staff were teachers engaged in the cognitive projects, followed immediately by teacher aides and other paraprofessionals in the same field. The smallest percent of staff were nonprofessionals engaged in noncognitive projects.



Staff not directly engaged in project activities. About one thousand staff members were not directly engaged in project activities but worked to support project activities (graph 9) and were paid from project funds. Thus for every one of such supporting staff there were slightly more than four staff members directly engaged in project activities.

The distribution of the support staff differs from the "directly engaged staff" in several ways

- A. The second largest number of support staff are the administrators and supervisors (as opposed to teacher aides and nonprofessionals).
- B. There were a few more nonprofessional staff members, such as classroom and bus aides, in the noncognitive project activities in the support services than staff directly engaged.


Inservice education of staff. Over 2900 staff members received some form of inservice education. From data on file, information was obtained which separates New York City into two categories, that is, those conducted by the Central Board and those of the Community Districts. The upstate data were separated to projects conducted in the Big Five Cities and in the remainder of the State. Within such divisions it was ascertained whether the training was less than one week's duration, one to four weeks or more than four weeks in length. Similarly, it was determined whether or not college credit was obtained upon completion of the work.

Of the 2900 staff, 50 percent of the total were engaged in cognitive project work. No administrators or supervisors and no nonprofessionals received college credits for the inservice training. Of the 202 people in


the subset who did receive college credit, 150 or 74 percent were New York Community District teachers in cognitive projects. The remaining 52 were evenly divided among the cognitive and noncognitive projects. Over 94 percent of the 52 were from New York City's Community Districts.

Graph 9

Staff Not Directly Engaged in Urban Education Project Activities



From graph 10 it may be seen that teachers and paraprofessionals in cognitive projects constituted the highest percent of staff receiving inservice education and that in noncognitive projects the highest percent were teachers.



Exemplary Reports

From an examination of data submitted by school districts, it was found that some projects contained components in which goals were achieved to a degree beyond expectation. In these projects which are illustrated, the average rate of gain usually exceeded one month for each month the project operated.

Illustrations of Projects with Above Average Gains

It is the purpose of this section to provide an abstract for 1972 of each of 13 projects considered to be exemplary in terms of illustrating the effects that sound, well managed Urban Education projects can have upon the students whom they serve. The criteria for selection was sufficient evidence supplied by the district indicating substantial attainment of project objectives. Two general project categories are discussed throughout the report. Cognitive projects are generally associated with the intent to improve academic achievement such as a gain in reading comprehension. Noncognitive projects include such areas as the improvement of self-image and a better attitude toward school. The projects described herein deal mainly with the basic skills, where decades of research and application have developed rather defensible measuring devices. In each of the selected projects, participating students have shown a gain of one month or more per one month of project treatment as measured by standardized measurement devices. Given the nature of the academic background of Urban Education project students, the growth represents a substantial gain in learning outcomes.

It should be noted that the following abstracts may discuss only a given component or components of an entire project and they are not meant to be summaries of the complete projects, but only those aspects which meet the criteria for the selection. Several projects were also designed to produce positive growth in student adjustment as indicated by change in emotional or social behaviors. Growth in such an area suffers from difficulty in empirical validation. Although the activities directed toward achieving gains in noncognitive areas may have been part of the projects, they are not reflected in the following abstracts.

In addition to its function as a report document, the group of project abstracts provides project administrators, planners, and implementers with information about some projects which demonstrated noticeable gains. Other eligible districts with similar needs may be able to benefit from the experiences gained in the projects reported herein.

1. An "Open Day" Classroom at JHS 113X

The project was operated in New York City Community District 11 (Bronx) with a budget of \$42,863 and 25 participants in grades 7 through 9 (cost/participant \$1,684).

Major Objectives: As a result of the project, students will show statistically significant gains in reading and computational skills as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Activities: Students were selected by the guidance counselor in consultation with teachers, parents, and grade supervisors. The children were severely retarded in reading and mathematics and frequently manifested behavioral problems. They were placed in the "Open Day" self contained classroom where basic skills are approached through drawing upon the students' personal experiences and community environment. The project included field trips for cultural experience, and the classroom program was tied into the experiences through dramatization, tapes, and writings. The students used art as a medium of expression and were also given physical education and industrial art. Scheduling was highly flexible and highly individual.

Findings: Student gains in both mathematics and reading exceeded the one year gain that can be expected of the average child. Gains were significant at the .01 confidence level.

2. Academic Cultural Engagement

The project was operated in New York City Community District 11 (Bronx) with a budget of \$21,040 and 45 participants in grades 7 through 9 (cost/participant \$443).

Major Objectives: To improve performance of project participants in reading and mathematics. It is expected that a statistically significant gain will be achieved as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

1/This would happen by chance only 1 time in 100.

To improve language facility as measured by the Pupil Census Form. To increase parent involvement. To decrease behavior problem referrals.

Activities:

The guidance counselor, in consultation with parents, teachers, and grade supervisors selected 45 students of Puerto Rican background who were experiencing extreme academic difficulty, further resulting in poor attendance and behavior. The students attended weekly group counseling sessions to discuss common problems; each student also participated in a number of individual guidance sessions to discuss personal problems, anxieties, and ambitions. Each was provided with weekly tutoring sessions in math and reading by older students or college students of Puerto Rican background. Materials included programmed learning workbooks. Speakers from the community and group or individual sessions for parents were also part of the program.

Findings:

Gains made by pupils in reading and math were significant at the .01 level. The mean gain was 1.2 months for each month of participation in the project. Language facility of students increased and parent participation increased while behavior problem referrals dropped.

3. Learning Laboratories to Enrich the Reading Program

The project was operated in New York City Community District 26 (Queens) with a budget of \$212,318 and 1,810 participants in grades 3 through 9 (cost/participant \$117).

Major Objectives: To achieve statistically significant growth in reading skills of participants as measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test.

Activities:

In each of 29 participating schools, a mobile Learning Laboratory Resource Center, provided with audio visual equipment and materials, reading materials, and games was set up to encourage reading through growth in concept development, vocabulary, and oral expression. A corrective reading teacher and educational assistant provided intensive small group and individual instruction. The project emphasized oral-aural experience with students reading along while listening to tapes followed by a discussion of the material. A flexible schedule provided students with varying lengths of study time according to need.

Findings:

The gains in reading skills of the participants in each grade were significant at the .01 level. The mean gain for the 822 children who were tested was 10 months. The average gain for 132 children in grade 3 was 21 months.

4. Paraprofessional Program

The project was operated in Niagara Falls with a budget of \$34,650 and 400 participants in grades Prekindergarten through 6 (cost/participant \$69).

Major Objectives: 75% of the participants were expected to achieve seven months growth on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Activities: Paraprofessionals who were parents indigenous to the area helped staff members in a program of activities which led to a successful integration program. 33 aides were placed in eight schools. The aides worked in classrooms, lunch areas, libraries, all purpose rooms, and indoor and outdoor play areas. Students participated in individual and group activities of educational and inter-relational value.

Findings: Average reading achievement gain was found to be one year two months while mathematics achievement was one year's growth.

5. Reading in Vacation Day Camps

The project was operated in New York City Community District 22 (Brooklyn) with a budget of \$13,668 and 224 participants in grades 2 through 5 (cost/participant \$61).

Major Objectives: To raise the reading levels of at least 75% of the participants by three months or more.

Activities: The project was part of a summer school playground program. Teachers taught decoding skills using Building Reading Skills Series, teacher-made materials and other phonic materials to groups of 15 pupils. Students were taught comprehension skills using Skilltexts and SRA Reading Labs. Library books were also available for use.

Findings: The reading grade equivalent scores for over 75% of the children were raised by three months or more during the one and one-half month summer program.

6. State Urban Education Umbrella

The project was operated in New York City Community District 24 (Queens) with a budget of \$446,552 and 2,048 participants in grades Kindergarten through 9 (cost/participant \$218).

Major Objectives: To achieve a statistically significant increase in the reading level of participants as measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. To increase the ability of non-English speaking pupils to understand and speak English through intensive individualized ESL instruction.

Activities: There were three components in this project. The first, a Reading Diagnosis and Treatment Center, provided corrective reading teachers to each of 14 schools. The teachers grouped and instructed disadvantaged students according to extent of reading disability. The instruction was remedial utilized individualized programmed materials. The second component, the English as a Second Language Program, provided intensive daily instruction in English to approximately 800 non-English speaking students. Emphasis was on English oral and comprehension skills, utilizing programmed materials. The third component, the School Volunteer Program, complemented the reading and ESL components by providing 200 school volunteers to individually instruct students in the other components.

Findings: Children in grades 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 made gains above anticipated scores in word knowledge, comprehension and total reading which were significant at the .01 level.

7. Operation Search

The project was operated in New York City Community District 27 (Queens) with a budget of \$202,793 and 1,750 participants in grades 1 through 9 (cost/participant \$116).

Major Objectives: 60% of the participants will achieve a statistically significant increase in reading and arithmetic levels as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. 60% of the participants will achieve a significant improvement in report card grades in curricular subjects.

Activities: Participants received individual and small group counseling regarding study skills, achievement levels, vocational opportunities, and educational motivation. A program of individual and small group remediation was developed for each child, aided by the use of paraprofessionals and tutors. Instruction was aided through extensive use of modern audio visual equipment. The students also visited colleges, schools, business plants, offices, and factories. Parent and community meetings were held to enhance overall involvement.

Findings: Participants gains measured by standardized tests and by teacher grades were significant at the .01 level.

8. Uplifting Basic Skills

The project was operated in Troy with a budget of \$89,667 and 448 participants in grades 1 through 12 (cost/participant \$200).

Major Objectives: To improve the reading achievement of participants at a rate commensurate with their ability. To improve computational skills and problem solving ability in mathematics as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Activities: The project focused upon children in the middle grades. Three classes of underachievers worked in self-contained classrooms where individualized instruction was stressed. Other participants were aided by two corrective reading teachers. Emphasis was upon reading for comprehension, phonics, word building, and vocabulary. A combination Library Instructional Media-Resource Center enhanced individualization through books, materials, and resources to meet both interests and ability level. The center served also as a resource for teachers, providing a variety of supportive and reading-related audio-visual materials and equipment.

Findings: The mean gain in both mathematics and reading was 1.7 years.

9. Development of an Educational Program for Former Narcotic Addicts and Drug Users in a Narcotic Addiction Agency

The project was operated in New York City Special Schools with a budget of \$197,192 and 150 participants in grades 7 through 12 and nongraded elementary (cost/participant \$1,315).

Major Objectives: To significantly raise achievement levels in reading and math as measured by the California Achievement Test.

To develop and evaluate educational methods and materials especially applicable to this group.

Activities:

Each student's achievement level and learning style was diagnosed and materials and techniques to meet the individual's need were prescribed. Three groups of students were developed: the first consisted of students readily prepared to pass the High School Equivalency Test; the second was composed of students in need of further remediation to improve skills; the third group were low achieving students who were provided with more intensive individual basic skill instruction. Instructional materials included audio-visual approaches to reading and math. A program of arts, crafts, and photography provided multi-sensory instruction. A program was developed for nongraded elementary pupils and for emotionally disturbed adolescents. Tutorial and guidance services were made available.

Findings:

Students in the Special Narcotics School registered gains in both reading and math while were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

10 . Mathematics Laboratories

The project was operated in New York City Community District 8 (Bronx) with a budget of \$309,911 and 3,780 participants in grades 1 through 8 (cost/participant \$82).

Major Objectives: To improve achievement in mathematics by providing many manipulative experiences with physical materials. Growth will be statistically significant as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test in mathematics and by teacher-made instruments.

Activities:

The program included scheduling two forty minute math laboratory periods a week relating to math studies in class. A new curriculum involving "Flow Chart" procedures was developed to enable low achievers to solve complicated problems through the use of calculators. The approach aided students to comprehend concepts involved in the calculating process. "Madison Project" math materials were used to aid learning of math concepts on an individual basis.

Findings:

Based upon test scores of children in the 6th grade, statistically significant gains were made in mathematics. The mean gain in mathematics scores for each of five of the eight school participating in the project was one year three months. Two schools each had a mean gain of at least one year seven months per one year of treatment.

11. Extended Language Development

The project was operated in Schenectady with a budget of \$202,614 and 1,229 participants in grades Prekindergarten through 9 (cost/participant \$165).

Major Objectives: To achieve statistically significant growth in reading skills of students in grades 3 - 6 as measured by the a) Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales and b) Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP). To achieve a statistically significant increase in Vocabulary and Reading skills of secondary level participants as measured by a) The Word Clue Test, and b) The Reading Versatility Tests.

Further, to achieve a statistically significant increase in general reading skills of a) students in grades 7 - 9 as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills; b) students in grade 9 as measured by Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) tests; and c) a sample of students in grades 10 and 12 as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests.

Activities:

The project provided additional specialized personnel in reading and English language development in order to increase small group and individual instruction for students deficient in language arts. Instructional materials in daily use were: Programmed Reading, the Palo Alto Reading Program, Chandler Language Experience Readers, and the Charles E. Merrill Linguistic Reading Program. Teacher aides from the community were provided. In-service courses in the arts and other media were devised to broaden teacher skills in working with inner-city children. Skilled specialists in arts and craft areas conducted workshops. Library books and audio visual materials and devices were used to enhance the project. Field trips were included.

Findings:

Reading scores were statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence with pupils showing gains of up to 2 years 5 months.

12. Tutorial Community Education Center I

The project was operated in Yonkers with a budget of \$149,659 and 831 participants in grades 1 through 12 (cost/participant \$180).

Major Objectives: To sufficiently improve language mastery in students of English as a second language to permit at least 90% to return to the regular classroom, as measured by a teacher-made test.

To achieve statistically significant achievement in reading and math grade levels in the Franklin Tutorial Program by at least 3 months, as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests.

To achieve a statistically significant growth in mathematics and reading levels in St. Peter's Tutorial Center with participants improving at least 3 months as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Activities:

The project had three components which proved exemplary:

English as a Second Language students attended regularly scheduled classes and remedial tutorial sessions, as well as participating in physical education and recreational activities, field trips and a lunch program. Available equipment and materials were used for implementation of the instructional program, including various audio-visual devices. The audio-flash card reader provided for individualized reinforcement of reading and mathematics concepts. A comprehensive in-service program was developed to support project activities.

The Franklin tutorial program provided tutorial, remedial assistance and guidance services.

Tutorial and remedial assistance was given to the students at St. Peter's Tutorial Center on an individual or small group basis. Assistance was followed by enrichment activities which included films, educational games, and motivational materials.

Findings:

Ninety percent of the students tested demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the English language to enter the regular school program. For elementary students there was a mean gain in reading of one year, one month and for math the mean gain was nine months. Secondary students showed gains of one year, four months in word knowledge and one year gain in math.

13. Auxiliary Services for High Schools

The project was operated in New York City by the Central Board with a budget of \$1,539,876 (proposed) and approximately 9,000 participants (cost/participant \$171.)

Major Objectives:

To continue the education of dropouts by enrolling them in evening academic skills classes leading to attainment of a High School Equivalency Diploma and placement of participants in jobs permitting

them to continue education at night.

Activities:

Central and satellite learning and counseling centers were operated in each of the five boroughs. Each center provided educational, job placement and counseling services.

Findings:

Seventy-eight percent of students in the program attained High School Equivalency Diplomas in comparison to a city-wide rate of 45% and a state-wide rate of 42%. One-thousand nine-hundred seventy (1970) participants were placed in jobs with 38% receiving more than \$90 a week. This was a 40% increase over 1970-71. Two-hundred twenty-five (225) participants were placed in post secondary educational institutions or training programs. Reading and Mathematics achievement was significantly improved. Reading growth was 1.6 years while mathematics growth was 1.8 years for one year of project participation.

Extent of Incorporation of Process or
Product Into Ongoing School Program


This section of the report will deal with two aspects of process and product incorporation, the first being the extent of incorporation, and the second being the kind of processes or products incorporated. The basic source for this body of information is the Mailed Interim Information Report for the 1971-72 year as reported by the local district. Information regarding process/product incorporation was given in response to the question on the form which reads, "Have any of the activities or procedures developed in this project been adapted for use in the regular school program...If Yes, briefly describe the activities or procedures." Responses to the question have been obtained for each project in each district.

For the purposes of this section, the projects have been categorized according to main activity area. The categories coincide with those used by the Division of Educational Finance and the Urban Education Office Coding System 1971-72. A more complete explanation of each activity category can be seen in Chapter III (Finance) of this report. Included in graph 11 are the five activity areas in which 50% or more of the projects were designated by the districts as having incorporated some process or product into the ongoing school program. The highest percentage is in the "Recruitment and Employment" activity where twelve of nineteen projects were incorporated to some extent. Three types of educational process or practices were designated as having been adopted. They were: (1) the use of para-professionals to enhance classroom management and individualized instruction (two programs pointed out that parent volunteers are used as para-professionals in the ongoing school programs), (2) improved classroom methodology and organization, and (3) the adaptation of teacher training projects and techniques.

Both "English as a Second Language" and "Experimental" activity areas included ten projects of which six were incorporated into the ongoing program. The incorporation of the approach frequently included the adaptation of bilingual curriculum, materials, and inservice projects. Various processes were adopted by the districts as a result of their experience with "Experimental" projects. Among those mentioned were increased individualization of learning, improved classroom and school organization, increased use of multi-media and learning resources, and improved school involvement.

The "Basic Skills" activity area included seventy-eight projects of which forty-four were incorporated. Thirty-four of the "Basic Skills"

Graph 11



projects treated basic reading skills, nine were directed toward improvement of mathematics skills, four deal with science skills, and four projects dealt with other areas. Approximately twenty-six of the reading projects introduced new materials or new approaches. Many of these reading projects had the effective of individualizing instruction through such approaches as individual reading packets, progress charts, multi-media, profile analysis, and the use of paraprofessionals and/or tutors. Several introduced new means of diagnostic reading services and remedial approaches. Other processes

mentioned were testing devices, classroom management, and teacher training. Several of the math projects introduced mathematics laboratories, resource centers, and materials. Also mentioned in the basic skill area were tutorial services and overall teaching techniques. An overview of the processes incorporated into basic skills education in the regular school program appears to center around the introduction of new materials, new equipment, and individualized instruction.

Five of nine Urban Education projects categorized as "Curriculum Development", introduced products and/or processes to enhance the regular school curriculum. Two of the projects developed materials, resources, and teaching techniques in Black Studies, while two developed similar curricular materials in Puerto Rican and Hispanic Studies. The products have been and are being, integrated into the regular school curricula in social studies and related areas. The fifth project in curriculum developed a school and community newsletter which has been adapted by other schools of the district.


The above mentioned activity areas represent a total of 126 projects of which 73 introduced some process or product which was incorporated later in regular school programs. An overview of all data concerning incorporation reveals that an unduplicated total of 266 projects, not including Administrative Budget (AB) projects were operated from July 1971 through June 1972. Of these, 122 developed aspects which later were incorporated into the regular school program, representing 46% of the projects. New York City school districts incorporated processes or products from ninety-four of 208 projects, a percentage of 45.1 percent; upstate school districts, incorporated processes or products from twenty-eight of fifty seven projects, a percentage of 49.1 percent.

Another aspect of the extent of incorporation is the breakdown of projects into Quality Incentive (QIP) projects and Community Education Center (CEC) projects. The QIP projects have had a more influential effect upon ongoing education, with approximately 53 percent of the projects being incorporated in some manner, while 31 percent of the CEC projects in the program developed process or products valuable to the ongoing school program.

Of the five activities, in which 50% or more of the projects incorporated processes or products, a comparison of QIP and CEC projects may be seen in graph 12.

Graph 12

Percent of Projects Incorporated Into Ongoing School Program
by Type



1970-71 Exemplary Projects Incorporated In 1971-72 Program

In the "Supplementary Report of Selected Urban Education Projects," dated March 17, 1972, the Education Department produced a selection of 31 Urban Education projects from the 1970-71 school year which

contained valid hard data illustrating the effects that sound, well-managed Urban Education projects could have upon the students they serve. An appropriate approach to the measurement of the lasting effect of the exemplary projects would be to ascertain the number of the same projects which were designated as having incorporated some process or product into the regular school program. A breakdown is given in table 8 of that comparison by Project Area. As the table indicates, 58.1 percent of those designated as exemplary were also designated as incorporating some aspect into the ongoing program. Further, each individual area category designated 50 percent or more of the exemplary projects as having incorporated some aspect. Of the 18 projects designated as both exemplary and incorporated, 11 designated exemplary approaches to the teaching of basic skills, 4 were related to approaches in teaching English as a second language, 1 to techniques of bilingual education, and 2 were pupil service programs.

Table 8

1970-71 Exemplary Projects with Processes and/or
Products that were Incorporated into the
1971-72 Regular School Year

Project Area	Number of Projects Listed as Exemplary in the 1970-71 U. E. Report	Number of Projects Whose Processes and/or Products were Incorporated into Regular School Programs
New York City	20	11 (55%)
Central Board	2	2 (100%)
<u>Big Five</u> Albany Buffalo Rochester Syracuse Yonkers	3	2 (66.7%)
Upstate	6	3 (50%)
Totals	31 (100%)	18 (58.1%)

Achievement in Reading and Mathematics

Disadvantaged learners, once identified, are eligible to participate not only in Urban Education funded activities, but also in activities of the federally supported ESEA, Title I Program. New York State receives approximately $3\frac{1}{2}$ times the allocation in ESEA, Title I, for the 30 districts served by Urban Education as the Urban Education Program provides. Both Urban Education and ESEA, Title I are intended to bring about increments of change in academic achievement in the areas of basic skills in comparably disadvantaged students. Additionally, as was indicated by the quotation from the Education Law in the Summary, the relationship of the two major programs must be reported.

Experience with the older ESEA, Title I Programs, indicated that the policy of spreading the services purchased by compensatory education programs to touch as many disadvantaged learners as possible was not effective in bringing about change in academic ability. A State level policy emerged which suggested that a concentration of services (e.g., remedial teachers, pupil personnel services) on a few target youngsters would increase the likelihood of reversing the trend of selected youngsters falling further and further behind their more academically advantaged peers. Essentially, this policy resulted in (a) a reduction in the number of identified academically disadvantaged pupils served, and (b) a use of Federal and State compensatory aid monies in a complementary fashion on similar and sometimes identical youngsters during the same year or alternate fiscal years.

An Urban Education target pupil in a district could participate in an activity funded by ESEA, Title I during the first semester, while the second semester of the same pupil could be in an activity funded by Urban Education. An Urban Education target group might participate in a classroom that was made smaller than the normal classroom by the additional staffing of teachers

(paid out of ESEA, Title I funds) and paraprofessionals (paid for by Urban Education funds). It would not be unusual for a disadvantaged learner to participate in an ESEA, Title I funded remedial reading project conducted during the school day and then participate in a Community Education Center (Urban Education funded) tutorial or homework helper project after school.

A study of change in academic achievement in one compensatory aid program should permit inferences to another compensatory aid program when the learner's characteristics are the same, the pedagogical techniques and treatment variables are consistent between funded sources, and the degree of implementation is similar. Given the complementary intention of the two compensatory aid programs under the policy of concentrating services, the impossible task posed for evaluators would be to attribute (partial) increments of pupil achievement separately to two or more funding sources. Since a high degree of cross compensatory program coordination exists in New York State, the Education Department has been able to request that districts apply only one measurement plan to assess change in a particular group eligible for both funding sources and receiving comparable remedial treatments. (Even if the attribution of effects by funding source were easily accomplished, the uncoordinated measurement plans would subject some disadvantaged learners to three or more pretests with repeated post-tests imposed by several compensatory aid programs in the same subject area).

The results of a survey of reading achievement by participants in districts where disadvantaged learners are eligible for both ESEA, Title I and Urban Education are presented below.

The survey isolated projects where participants were achieving in reading at a faster rate than had occurred before federal

funds were made available for remedial services. Earlier studies^{1/} appeared to indicate that the simple effort to assess pupil performance on the basis of one month gain in reading ability for one month exposure to a compensatory reading treatment did not provide sufficient information to make judgements about change in pupil performance. Some educators seriously questioned whether a month gain in achievement for a month in school as a criterion of success was realistic since the target groups were selected for participation on the basis of far below normal growth in the regular classroom.

Such educators further argued that the expectation of a month-for-month growth for the disadvantaged learner who might be two or more years behind his more educationally advantaged peer, was naive. A consensus among Northeastern States educators who worked with the disadvantaged was reached after the States of Rhode Island and New York disclosed that they had been experimenting with alternate criteria that were well received by state and local educators concerned with programs reported by compensatory aid. The New York State Plan attempts to predict the amount of gain in grade equivalent units a target group in selected districts would achieve without the intervention of compensatory aid. The amount of gain that is predicted is based upon the pupils' own past history of growth (regression). Local district evaluators then compare the predicted posttest mean score with the mean actually obtained at the posttest. Inferences related to project success are made on the basis of whether a statistically significant difference occurred between the predicted and actual posttests.

^{1/}Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.

American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, ESEA I - Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data for fiscal years 1965-1970, March 1972.

District-submitted data were accepted at face value but, if obvious errors in entries were disclosed during scanning the evaluation forms, follow-up letters or telephone calls were made. Otherwise, no extensive system of data verification was implemented.

The districts were committed to specific but varied evaluation designs when the proposal application was approved. In many cases designs involved equivalent nontreatment groups, diagnostic or criterion referenced instruments, or data manipulations involving scores or means in other than grade equivalent units (e.g., raw scores, percentile ranks, and stanines). Since the study commenced when data were already being submitted (at the close of the school year), a decision was made to include only those projects which contained standardized norm referenced achievement data reported in grade equivalents.

Because of time limitations for completion of the study, only those projects that had submitted completed reporting forms by September 30, 1972 were considered.

Reading and mathematics within the cognitive domain constituted the focus of the survey. If a district proposed to enhance a target group's self image through increased competency in reading performance, the results of the particular treatment were analyzed in the survey for a change in word knowledge and/or comprehension, but not in terms of self-image.

The target group data were analyzed by participation in a specific project's activity. A pupil was considered to be a participant in a reading activity if he was tested for increments of achievement in reading. If the same pupil participated and was tested in a remedial mathematics activity, that pupil was also considered to be a mathematics activity

participant. Pupils were counted by activity within a project. All totals are by activity-participants--a figure that does not necessarily eliminate duplication in summing for an unduplicated count of activity recipients. A slight duplication in total participation also occurs if a pupil is treated in a remedial reading session during the regular school year under one project and again during the summer under another project. However, such duplication in unduplicated pupil counts is less than 1% since the majority of the summer of 1972 New York City projects were not included in the survey. The rigorous criteria applied to the data during analysis makes the slight duplication insignificant.

The initial survey generated 65 projects that sought to change pupil behavior in reading or mathematics. The projects were classified by project duration, that is, regular school year, summer session, or yearlong. Within the project life span, a further categorization indicated whether a project was new or resubmitted.

Use of a frequency distribution determined which academic emphasis within the sample of projects was foremost in the district's plans. The distribution was accompanied by an assignment of allocations within the selected area of emphasis.

The data presented in this report are from only those groups of pupils receiving both a pretest and posttest. The decision reduced the data base with the greatest reduction in the data base occurring in New York City projects. Sampling plans are employed in projects to avoid testing every pupil in an activity. So many principles of sampling were violated in decentralized district projects that the decision was made to make no inferences to the universe from which the samples were drawn. The decision to report data in a conservative fashion means that there may exist in New

York City decentralized districts nearly 10 times (over 100,000 pupils) the number of activity-participants reported in this survey, who met the criteria of a faster rate of gain during the treatment, than they did prior to the 1971-72 activity.

If a school district failed to compute a predicted posttest under the six-step formula provided by the State, a separate analysis was conducted. Although all activities analyzed in this survey contained pretest means and posttest means provided by the district, some districts supplied predicted posttests according to formula while other districts did not.

Together, the series of conservative decisions during data analysis might tend to reduce the estimated impact of the intervention of reading and mathematics activities. However, the methods and operations selected above provide a defensible vantage point for discussions by administrators and legislators.

The sample of projects that met the criteria described above were predominantly regular school year projects. Seventy-seven percent operated sometime between September 1971 and June 1972. Twelve percent had yearlong activities that spanned both the regular school year and summer.

The percent of projects in the sample is illustrated in table 9 by both duration of operation and history of implementation. Projects were categorized as either resubmitted or new. The former had been implemented in previous fiscal years. Apparently, resubmitted projects 1/ in this sample predominated in successfully meeting the objectives of bringing about increments in academic achievement.

1/ New York City decentralized district projects, which heavily dominate this sample, are usually assigned a resubmitted status, when in fact New York City projects are usually a blend of new and resubmitted functions.

Table 9
Percent of Projects by Duration of funding

Category	Regular Session	Summer Session	Yearlong	Total
New	6.2%	3.1%	0%	9.3%
Resubmitted	70.8	9.2	10.7	90.7
Total	77.0	12.3	10.7	100.0

Each project, when approved by the Education Department, proposes to serve a limited number of pupils. However, during implementation adjustments in the number of participants often occurs. Some pupils, originally diagnosed as severely in need of remedial services, quickly recover deficient skills and are replaced by other pupils on a waiting list. Such a practice tends to escalate the number of participants served in the duration of the project, but it does not necessarily mean that the day by day treatment for a fixed number of participants has been diluted through expanded enrollment. Alternately, other projects, most notably in New York City decentralized districts, propose to service pupils entering a school under an open enrollment policy. When the enrollments do not occur as predicted projects are rewritten and participation is reduced.

The participation figures reported below are summarized at a project level. While the figures are unduplicated by project, not all participants in a project must have participated in a reading or mathematics remedial activity in fiscal 1971-72 in New York State. Districts were free to conduct remedial activities in areas such as speech therapy, industrial arts, science, and social studies, as well as in reading and mathematics.

The proposed and actual level of participation by project, the number of reading activity-participants and the number of mathematics activity-participants by grade interval whose scores were used in this study are listed below.

A.	Participants proposed to be served in the entire sample (project level)	398,550
B.	Participants reported as served in the entire sample (project level)	403,248
C.	Elementary (grades 1-6) remedial reading participants whose scores were analyzed in this sample	37,567
D.	Secondary (grades 7-12) remedial reading participants whose scores were analyzed in this sample	3,213
E.	Elementary remedial mathematics participants whose scores were analyzed in this sample . . .	5,001
F.	Secondary remedial mathematics participants whose scores were analyzed in this sample . . .	1,394

Since the study was concerned with projects that contained increments of change in reading and mathematics, the sample projects were surveyed for each district's commitment to changing disadvantaged learners' behavior in basic skills as reflected by the district's assignment of funds to such activities. Annual report forms elicited the project information by requesting the district to identify the treatment by grade interval with the greatest amount of funds allocated to that activity. Upon sorting the sample projects into the categories (by financial commitment) of (1) elementary reading, (2) secondary reading, (3) elementary math, (4) secondary math, and (5) other, elementary reading (73 percent) appeared to be the most frequently selected category by the districts. No district selected elementary or secondary mathematics as first priority. Twenty-one percent of the projects with achievement gains beyond expectation in reading had not designated achievement in reading as a priority.


Educators have found that the rate of gain for disadvantaged students

has ranged from .5 to .7 month per month activity. Consistently in the sample a larger rate of gain for pupils occurred during the remedial reading activities than prior to the treatments.


For 18,061 students, school districts reported rates of gain in reading before and during treatment. The increase in rate attributable to participation in compensatory projects was from .62 to .89 months of achievement for each month spent in school (see graph 13, bars 1 and 2). For an additional 22,719 students, districts reported only gains during treatment but the rate of gain prior to treatment was not available. Achievement improved at a rate of 1.07 months for each month in school for this group (see bar 3). For 40,780 students (bars 2 and 3 combined) the average gain during treatment was almost one month (.99 month) for each month in school. Thus, participation in categorically aided projects increased the students rate of gain from .62 months to .99 months, a 50 percent increase in the achievement rate.

Graph 13

Mean Rate of Gain Per Month for Elementary
and Secondary Reading
Months




Rate of Gain in Reading




Similarly, for 1,141 students, school districts reported rates of gain in mathematics before and during treatment. The increase in rate attributable to participation in compensatory projects was from .56 to 1.57 months of achievement for each month spent in school (see graph 14, bars 1 and 2). For an additional 5,254 students, districts reported only gains during treatment but the rate of gain prior to treatment was not available. Achievement improved at a rate of 1.80 months for each month in school for this group (see bar 3). For 6,395 students (bars 2 and 3 combined) the average gain during treatment was 1.76 months for each month in school. Thus, participation in categorically aided projects increased the students rate of gain from .56 months to 1.76 months, a 200 percent increase in achievement rate. Furthermore, pupils who learn at a rate of 1.76 months for every

Graph 14

Mean Rate of Gain Per Month for Elementary and Secondary Mathematics



	- Rate of gain prior to treatment	} 1,141 students
	- Rate of gain during treatment-	
	- Rate of gain during treatment-	} 5,254 students

month in school not only cease to fall further behind their more advantaged peers, but also close the gap academically between where they are and where they could be.

It is clear that for both reading and mathematics instruction provided by special funding that the rate of gain consistently exceeds the historical rate achieved without special help.

CHAPTER III: FINANCE

In accordance with the 1972-73 education law quoted earlier a fiscal analysis is provided of the distribution of Urban Education funds in the eligible school districts of the State^{1/} including the programmatic and financial relationship these funds had when integrated with expenditures of certain other categorical State aid^{2/} and Federal aid appropriated through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) Titles I, II, III, VIB, and VII.

Classification System

For purposes of the financial analyses, three primary classification groups were used: district categories, budget classifications and project activities.

District Categories

The Urban Education districts were classified into three categories. The major school population centers excluding New York City are "The Big Five": Albany, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers; these cities were considered as one category. New York City, the major population center with the largest school system in New York State, constituted a special category. The third category, composed of the remaining 24 districts, was referred to as the "Rest of State."

^{1/}Albany, Amsterdam, Binghamton, Buffalo, Elmira, Freeport, Fulton, Glen Cove, Hempstead, Jamestown, Lackawanna, Long Beach, Middletown, Mount Vernon, Newburgh, New Rochelle, New York City, Niagara Falls, Ossining, Port Chester, Poughkeepsie, Rochester, Rome, Schenectady, Syracuse, Troy, Utica, Watertown, White Plains, Yonkers.

^{2/}The State programs include: Urban Education, Prekindergarten, Educational Television, and School Community Interaction Umbrella Programs.

Budget Classifications

The budget classifications which were used as a basis for analyzing the funding of programs in the Urban Education districts were: personal service-instructional, administration, personal service-noninstructional, employee benefits, equipment, supplies and materials, textbooks, evaluation, contractual agreement, consultant services, special travel of personnel, conference related expenses, inservice training workshops, health services, parent involvement, rental expenses, transportation of pupils, food services, overhead and other expenses.^{1/}

Project Activities

Each proposal submitted to the State Education Department by an eligible school district which requested and received State and/or Federal aid was read and classified according to major project activity. Classified activities included administration, basic skills, bilingual education, English as a second language, vocational-occupational education, health education, curriculum development, adult career development, cultural enrichment, handicapped, pupil personnel services, recruitment and employment, support services, early childhood education, experimental, and community education centers.^{2/}

^{1/}Categories are found in Form SA-165, pages B-1 through B-12 of Guidelines for New York State Urban Education Programs, The State Education Department, Office of Urban Education, Albany, New York (May 1969).

^{2/}From the Division of Urban Education Coding System 1971-72

A more complete description of the activities is given below:
Administration-all administrative costs; Basic Skills-involves diagnostic testing, reading, math, science, social studies and English; Bilingual Education-self explanatory; English as a Second Language-self explanatory; Vocational-Occupation Education-includes business, career education, home economics, work-study, and occupational subjects; Health Education-includes physical fitness, drug abuse education and family and sex education; Curriculum Development-includes a general review and adaptation, black studies and history, hispanic studies and history; Footnote continued on following page.

Analysis Limitations

Certain limitations were inherent in the collected data which are delineated below.

Project Categorization

Many projects were comprehensive in intent and contained several components for which multi-activities were used to achieve specified, but often divergent, objectives. Projects with more than one component did not indicate the percent of money approved, or the percent of the target population served, for each of the specified project activities and objectives. As a result, all financial and target population information was placed in the activity category having the major thrust of the project. Thus, for purposes of this report certain areas, notably basic skills, received a major categorization of the funds.

Participants

Each proposal was structured to serve a given target population. When the proposals were tallied according to program category and project activity, the resulting total represented duplicated target populations.

^{2/}Adult Career Development-includes basic skills, high school equivalency, career education and vocational occupations; Cultural Enrichment-includes music, art, drama, dance, performance, Afro-American culture and Hispanic-American cultures; Handicapped-includes physically, mentally emotionally and speech; Pupil Personnel Services-includes psychological, medical/dental, attendance, school social work, home-school counselor, guidance and counseling; Recruitment and Employment-includes teachers, paraprofessionals, home study centers and in-service training; Support Services-includes library, multi-media center, television, security services, food services, transportation, dissemination of information; Early Childhood Education-self explanatory; Experimental-includes all EEP programs; Community Education-includes area(s) above and can utilize facilities other than the regular school day. In 1971-72, 83 projects were listed as Community Education Centers. Of these 79 were subsumed under an activity listed above. Four had no single major focus, thus being categorized as Community Education.

Frequently, the total duplicated target population exceeded the total enrollment, since an individual was apt to participate in more than one program or project. Such limitations should be considered when making comparisons of participant enrollments between project activities and between program categories. Similarly, caution should be exercised when using expenditure-per-pupil ratios.

In addition, budget amendments submitted by districts usually make no reference to possible reductions or additions in the number of program participants. Since this information generally was not specified the original target population figures were reported.

Reporting Procedure

For purposes of the annual report financial and related data will be reported under three major headings, i.e.,

- A. Information relative to the Urban Education Program only
- B. The Urban Education Program in relationship to the programs specified in Subdivision 11, Section 3602 of the Education Law¹
- C. The Urban Education Program compared with other programs by district categories.

Urban Education Expenditures

Since the law permits certain contractual arrangements to be made which may be completed in a period following the funding year, a cutoff date short of the audited expenditures date had to be selected. For the year 1971-72, a date of October 1, 1972 was selected and will be used throughout the section unless otherwise noted.

¹/Programs include Educational TV, Prekindergarten, and Titles I, II, III, VI-B, and VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Projects in Urban Education Districts

From table 1 it may be seen that there were 656 specially aided projects from the sources enumerated earlier (Education Law) which were funded in the Urban Education program districts. Two hundred and ninety-seven of the total projects were under the auspices of Urban Education funding. Within the 297, a total of 183 projects were classified as Quality Incentive Grants or Projects (QIG or QIP).^{1/} Most Quality Incentive Projects are funded during the regular school day, whereas the Community Education Center's (CEC) are often conducted after school or during the evening.

Eighty-three of the Urban Education projects were approved for CEC's.^{1/} The "Big Six" cities of the State operated such centers, with the greatest number being located in New York City.

Thirty-one of the projects were used to support District Administrative Budgets or Central Administrative Budgets (AB)^{1/} in seven districts. The largest number, 25, or about 80 percent, of such projects were approved for the city of New York. Of the State's Big Six cities, Rochester and Syracuse did not have Administrative Budgets.

While the 656 approved projects were not of equal proportions either in dollar amount or number of participants, some indication of the magnitude of such categorically aided projects may be gained when it is realized that only 11 of the 30 local education agencies had 10 or more projects approved, with New York City leading with 378 projects. The next highest district was Buffalo with 33 approved projects.

Proposals for special projects are usually drawn up before the exact amount of funds available is known. Fund estimates are often based on

^{1/}Defined elsewhere in the report.

Table 10
Number of Projects by Program Type in Urban Education Districts

District	CEC	QIP	AB	Umbrella	Educa. TV	Pre-K	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title VI-B	Title VII	Totals
Albany	1	1	1				5	1	1	8		18
Amsterdam		1				1	1	1				4
Binghamton	1				1	1	2	2		2		9
Buffalo	1	7	1				14	2	1	6	1	33
Elmira	1						2	1				4
Freeport		1				1	5	1		3		11
Fulton		1					3	1				5
Glen Cove	1	1				1	1	1		1		6
Hempstead	1					1	1	1				4
Jamestown		1					1	1	1			4
Lackawanna		2					3	1				6
Long Beach		1				1	2	1				5
Middletown		1				1	1	1				4
Mt. Vernon		3	1			1	5	1		1		12
Newburgh	1					1	2	1				5
New Rochelle		1				1	5	1		1		9
New York City	64	144	25	4		6	86	5	16	15	13	378
Niagara Falls	2	3	1				5	2		1		14
Ossining		1					3	1				5
Port Chester		1					1	1				3
Poughkeepsie	1					1	3	1		1		7
Rochester	1	3				1	17	3	1	5	1	32
Rome		1					3	1	1	2		8
Schenectady	1	2	1			1	2	1		2		10
Syracuse	2	2			1	1	4	1	1	4		16
Troy		1				1	4	1				7
Utica		1					2	2	1	4		10
Watertown	1						3	2				6
White Plains		1				1	1	1				4
Yonkers	4	2	1			1	7	1		1		17
Totals	83	183	31	4	2	23	194	41	23	57	15	656

the previous year's allocation. In the 1971-72 program year, the final allocations were often less than the estimates. An examination of table 11 shows that nearly half of the Urban Education districts had approved budgets totaling more than the amount of aid provided. In these instances, the districts had to themselves provide the difference in amounts. Such amounts ranged from a few hundred dollars to over \$225,000 in the city of Rochester.

Table 12 provides an expansion of New York City data in table 11 by detailing the 31 decentralized districts, the Central Board, the citywide special school projects and the high school projects (the last two are often referred to locally as districts 32 and 33 respectively).

While table 12 may be read in the same fashion as table 11, several items seem noteworthy.

- A. About 50 percent of the CEC's are located in the three districts, 5, 14 and 23. One district i.e., 12 had the largest single sum approved for CEC project work.
- B. The same districts, i.e., Number 5, 12, 14 and 23 plus Number 19 did not offer QIP's. From the data it might be inferred that the operation of CEC's is generally more expensive than operating QIP's since 4 of the 5 districts had AB's costing in excess of 125,000 dollars each. No district which operated only QIP's had such expensive AB's. Further study of exactly what is being funded in such districts seems warranted.

Fiscal Analysis

A closer examination of the types of projects and amounts of funding gives an indication of the scope and complexity of the Urban Education Program.

Table 11

Approved Urban Education Funding by School District^{1/}

District	Approved Budget		AB	Total Approved Budget	71-72 Allocation	Aid
	CEC	QIP				
Albany	\$ 49,160	\$ 171,744	\$ 23,649	\$ 244,553	\$ 244,337	\$ 244,337
Amsterdam		37,396		37,936	38,344	37,936
Binghamton	14,055			14,055	16,195	14,055
Buffalo	294,571	2,070,889	93,347	2,458,807	2,377,624	2,377,624
Elmira	158,643			158,643	145,236	145,236
Freeport		77,183		77,183	78,002	77,183
Fulton		28,977		28,977	28,977	28,977
Glen Cove	12,405	11,184		23,589	23,812	23,589
Hempstead	96,055			96,055	93,059	93,059
Jamestown		31,500		31,500	31,078	31,078
Lackawanna		30,640		30,640	30,640	30,640
Long Beach		43,789		43,789	42,021	42,021
Middletown		33,442		33,442	33,442	33,442
Mt. Vernon		190,815	39,724	230,539	230,855	230,539
Newburgh	160,907			160,907	160,907	160,907
New Rochelle		126,941		126,941	122,037	122,037
New York City	13,077,178	24,292,642	2,040,313	39,410,133	39,475,619	39,374,633
Niagara Falls	92,633	265,807	36,278	394,718	399,115	394,718
Ossining		19,648		19,648	19,697	19,648
Port Chester		35,972		35,972	36,155	35,972
Poughkeepsie	53,031			53,031	53,139	53,031
Rochester	370,115	1,036,624		1,406,739	1,179,751	1,179,751
Rome		113,537		113,537	113,537	113,537
Schenectady	24,900	231,561	34,758	291,219	291,961	291,219
Syracuse	266,254	404,491		670,745	628,132	628,132
Troy		90,083		90,083	89,645	89,645
Utica		177,644		177,644	169,311	169,311
Watertown	12,829			12,829	12,693	12,693
White Plains		44,179		44,179	43,247	43,247
Yonkers	324,311	248,305		611,499	611,499	611,499
Totals	\$15,007,047	\$29,815,533	\$2,268,069	\$47,129,532	\$46,819,987	\$46,709,616

^{1/}Wyandanch and Roosevelt public schools receive a flat grant of \$90,000 each for a total of \$180,000 under section 3602, subdivision 11, paragraph g of Chapter 553 of the Laws of 1972.

Table 12

Approved Urban Education Funding Within New York City

District	Approved Budget			Total Approved Budget	71-72 Allocation	Aid
	CEC	QIP	AB			
Central Board		\$ 423,203	\$ 354,056	\$ 777,259	\$ 794,157	\$ 777,259
1		856,298	9,762	866,060	866,042	866,042
2		517,717		517,717	518,176	517,717
3		1,099,492		1,099,492	1,100,602	1,099,492
4	370,779	512,915	67,989	951,683	960,893	951,683
5	1,946,864		151,194	2,098,058	2,097,812	2,097,812
6		508,501	36,261	544,762	539,698	539,698
7	943,294	392,757	128,393	1,464,444	1,471,081	1,464,444
8		901,692	43,529	945,221	945,221	945,221
9		1,011,655	92,199	1,103,854	1,101,546	1,101,546
10		586,672	30,055	616,727	616,772	616,727
11		607,425		607,425	606,404	606,404
12	2,337,433		156,330	2,493,765	2,493,765	2,493,763
13	929,422	504,061	99,226	1,532,709	1,532,786	1,532,709
14	1,489,822		75,663	1,565,485	1,565,652	1,565,485
15		827,471	43,887	871,358	872,329	871,358
16	840,916	704,569	126,421	1,671,906	1,674,872	1,671,906
17		1,149,743		1,149,743	1,149,743	1,149,743
18		322,474	29,128	351,602	354,441	351,602
19	1,511,204		125,350	1,636,554	1,636,764	1,636,554
20		566,800	28,862	595,662	597,889	595,662
21		551,188	18,071	569,259	573,958	569,259
22		337,954		337,954	337,970	337,954
23	2,162,493		203,709	2,366,202	2,369,453	2,366,202
24		446,431		446,431	446,552	446,431
25		264,966	29,282	304,248	302,216	302,216
26		209,950		209,950	212,344	209,950
27		563,168		563,168	544,344	544,344
28	544,951		50,136	1,178,681	1,172,244	1,172,244
29		785,052	9,939	794,991	795,021	794,991
30		490,018	42,511	532,529	532,580	532,529
31		485,638	47,063	532,701	533,670	532,701
Special Schools 32		197,190		197,190	197,192	197,190
High Schools 33		7,874,498	41,297	7,915,795	7,961,378	7,915,795
Totals	\$13,077,178	\$24,293,092	\$2,040,313	\$39,410,583	\$39,475,619	\$39,374,633

1/Also known as District 34.

Project Activities

The activities reimbursable with Urban Education funds were enumerated earlier in the chapter.


It may be inferred that some districts believed that many of the problems associated with poverty could be solved through a basic skills approach; others felt that the provision of additional ancillary staff such as pupil personnel services would ameliorate the problems while still others used a mixture of the two.

The more popular of the activities approved through Urban Education funding are exhibited in graph 15. Collectively, the 6 activities accounted for about 75 percent of the nearly 47 million dollars expended. Basic skills activities throughout the State utilized slightly more than 25 percent of the funds. Pupil personnel services including guidance counselors and other workers accounted for over one-fifth of the funds.

Project Activity in New York City


The city of New York was approved for 39.4 million or 82 percent of the Urban Education funds. The 5 activities shown in graph 16 accounted for over 70 percent of the funds in New York City. Unlike the State as a whole, New York City spent the largest single sum of money in the pupil personnel services whereas Statewide money was used for basic skills activities. Two of the 5 activities exhibited in graph 16 are found only in New York City, namely experimental and English as a second language. Each of the remaining activities constituted less than 5 percent of the approved funds.

Graph 15



Graph 16


Urban Education Funding in New York City Showing Project Activity
Dollar Amount
in Millions



In graph 17 are displayed those community district combinations which were approved for sums in excess of 1.5 million dollars of Urban Education funds. Collectively, the 8 district combinations accounted for more than 50 percent of the City's approved funds. The bar marked multi-District represents the citywide High School Division.

Graph 17

Urban Education Funding in New York City Showing Community District



Project Elements


Discussions about projects up to this point were based on the premise that an entire project would be classified solely as of that type for which the majority of the funds were spent. That method of assignment or attribution is referred to as a major purpose listing.

The Urban Education program may be seen in another dimension when each project is broken down into its elements. Hence, using a multipurpose technique, a project could be classified in as many areas as were mentioned in the proposal. For example, a project which employed some curriculum development work and cultural enrichment in a basic skills area with administration and evaluation costs would be classified in all 5 areas. In a multipurpose listing, the emphasis is on counting the tallies of project elements which directly involved participants. The tally obviously will yield a total in excess of the actual number of projects. Thus, there were 697 educational or area element tallies contained in the 266 projects in the Urban Education Program.

Included were 242 project elements which were related to project administration and evaluation, a type not directly involved with participants. Project elements were combined into 23 broad categories, for example the Basic Academic Skills category was the sum of General Skills (combined Reading, Math and Language Arts), Remedial Reading, Remedial Mathematics, Remedial Science, Remedial Social Studies, Remedial English, and Elementary Experimental Programs. All of the categories were converted into percents of the total cost. Arrayed in ascending order in graph 18 are all of the categories which constituted an expense in excess of one million dollars. From this graph, it can be seen that the

greatest expenditure was for Basic Skills, the elements of which constitute an expense of nearly \$18 million. There are 11 other elements which exceeded a cost of one million dollars ranging down to "Curriculum Development," an element constituting an expense of \$1,151,600 or 2.46 percent of total program expenditures. The project elements of smaller expenditure not included in graph 18 in descending order include the following: Vocational-Occupational Education, Education for the Handicapped, Homework Study Centers, Integration, Health Education, Individualized Instruction, Camping and Environmental Education, Community Schools and College Visitation, and Adolescent Mothers.


Graph 18



Budget Classification in New York City

The Department's finance office assigns local district Urban Education expenditures to 20 budget classifications. From graph 19 it may be seen that 4 of the 20 classifications accounted for well over 80 percent of the funds in the State as a whole and the city of New York specifically.

It is likely that, district for district, the expenditures for staff account for 70 percent of the budget. Apparently, specialized programs such as those funded through categorical aid require more teachers because of the trend toward smaller class sizes with disadvantaged students and the use of one-to-one counseling or small group remediation.




State and Federal Program Funds

Eight programs referred to earlier in the report totaled over 225 million dollars in special aid for the 30 districts which are eligible for Urban Education aid.


From graph 20 it may be seen that ESEA Title I funds account for about 73 percent of the total both for the State as a whole as well as for New York City's portion of the total. Similarly, the Urban Education funds accounted for over 20 percent of the total. Of the total State and Federal funds, 188 million dollars was allocated to the city of New York. From this amount, 42 million dollars was received by the Central Board for support of high schools and special school programs in addition to administrative costs. The balance was distributed to community districts, two of which received in excess of 8 million dollars, namely districts 12 and 19. Another 4 community districts received between 7 and 8 million dollars, i.e., 7, 13, 15 and 23.

Graph 20



Project Activities for All Programs


From graph 21 it may be observed that over 82 percent of the total money (more than 225 million dollars) was spent on 5 out of a possible 16 activities. Whereas from 25 percent of the Urban Education funds was spent on basic skills activities, over 40 percent of the total money available was spent on basic skills areas. Nearly forty-three percent of the total money was spent on the remaining four activities displayed on the graph.



Participants in State and Federal Programs


There were nearly one and one half million participants-children, youth and adults-each for varying amounts of time in Urban Education districts who were the recipients of categorical aid through specially funded projects. From graph 22 it may be seen that 47 percent of the total participants were approved for Urban Education funding and only 39 percent for ~~Title I~~ funding despite the fact that ESEA Title I provides over 3.6 times as much money. Two observations may be made from the data.

- A. The attribution difference may be a function of a proposal application form and not reality.
- B. Dividing the approved funding found in some of the tables (such as table 12) by the number of participants (in Urban Education and in ESEA Title I) indicates that Urban Education funds were approved for a participant expenditure rate which was less than 25 percent of the amount approved per participant in ESEA Title I.



Estimations of participants in all programs funded in the Urban Education Program districts were attributed to 16 project activities and further separated into three major district categories. The five activities with the highest statewide percent of participants are shown in graph 23.

Graph 23



Budget Expenditures for Staff in All Programs

From graph 24 it may be noted that 80 percent of the available funds, for all of the programs reviewed, were spent for staff or staff related items. Although there are 22 potential budget classifications, 13 of them accounted for less than one percent each. In addition to the three shown in the chart and the 13 referred to above, the remaining six were ranked as follows: administration - 5 percent, supplies and materials - 4.4 percent, evaluation - 2.4 percent, transportation of pupils 1.1 percent, other expenses - 1.1 percent, and contractual agreements - 1 percent.

